

# THE SATURDAY REVIEW or POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

No. 1,345, Vol. 52.

August 6, 1881.

[ Registered for  
Transmission abroad.]

Price 6d.

## AFGHANISTAN.

THE victory of Karez-i-Atta has been followed in the natural course of things by the occupation of Candahar, and AYUB KHAN is now master of the city and territory from which, at the cost of a great humiliation and of much blood and treasure, he was last year excluded by England. The experiences of that campaign would have taught a prince possessed of much less military capacity than AYUB has shown the value of time, and, whatever his ultimate object may be, it may be taken for granted that he will pursue it without delay. Whether or no he advances on Cabul will probably be decided by the attitude of the Ghilzais, as to which there is no authentic intelligence; but that Southern as well as Western Afghanistan is lost to the AMEER may be taken as much for granted as anything in the kaleidoscopic regions of the East can be. There is no difference of opinion as to the immediate necessities which this event imposes on England. After the conduct we have pursued to fight AYUB in the interest of ABDURRAHMAN would be simply ridiculous, and only one degree more out of the question than to fight ABDURRAHMAN in the interest of AYUB. The great present harm is that the nominee of the English Government is beaten and the enemy of the English Government triumphant. For the future two things appear possible, either that ABDURRAHMAN will willingly or unwillingly give up the game altogether (in which case every Afghan and most inhabitants of Hindustan will regard AYUB as having forced his way to the throne in defiance of England), or else that a partition will be effected. This partition means that there will always be at least one potentate in Afghanistan eager for foreign help and quite indifferent to the quarter from which that foreign help comes, and that the holder of the northern provinces will be practically as much a Russian vassal as the Khan of BOKHARA. It is difficult to conceive how either of these consummations can be wished by any Englishman who is not either totally ignorant of the facts or blinded by prepossessions in favour of some particular theory.

The persistence with which all Afghan and Central Asian affairs are looked at, either from a party point of view or from the point of view of the prepossessions just alluded to, is a matter most profoundly to be regretted. The first impulse, for instance, of all the English Government journals on the arrival of the news of Karez-i-Atta was one of childish self-defence. "It does not matter to us; it has nothing to do with the evacuation of Candahar; if it does matter and has something to do, it was your fault for ever beginning an Afghan war." There can be few things more lamentable than this way of looking at questions which involve grave national interests. As a matter of fact, nothing is easier than to show that the mistake—to grant that it was a mistake—of the quarrel with SHERE ALI has no more to do with the present situation than the original misconduct of ADAM or of NOAH. Reasonable politicians have nothing to do with anything save immediately accomplished facts. The accomplished facts in this case are the disorganization of Afghanistan, the invasion of AYUB last year, the encroachments of Russia in Persia and Turkestan, the evacuation of Candahar. To go behind these may be very well worthy of a political philosopher or an historical student, but is altogether idle and absurd for a statesman. They are the facts with which we have to deal; the cir-

cumstances under which we have to act. Nor is it possible for all the audacity of partisanship, backed by all the ignorance of Eastern affairs, too common among English statesmen and journalists, to deny the two following propositions:—First, that the battle of Karez-i-Atta is a bad thing in itself for England, and a worse thing in its probable consequences; secondly, that but for the evacuation of Candahar the battle of Karez-i-Atta would never have happened. The second proposition even ignorance and audacity combined have not ventured to deny; the first has been sufficiently established by the remarks already made. No reasonable person advocates a fresh plunge at this moment into Afghan affairs; no one who is not possessed of a great deal of courage can assert that Afghan anarchy and Russian advances together make up a combination favourable to the future peace of India.

It is at least satisfactory, in the midst of many things that are not satisfactory at all, to take note of Lord HARTINGTON's observations as to the present state of Central Asian affairs. Lord HARTINGTON has, in some ways, disappointed observers of his political career, and it is by no means too certain that he possesses that knowledge of Asiatic affairs which his position demands. But he has plenty of common sense, and he is, on the whole, trustworthy. It is not forgotten that when Sir CHARLES DILKE made his famous and hopelessly delusive statement as to the intentions of Russia in the Candahar debate, Lord HARTINGTON poured cold water on his colleague's enthusiastic imagination, and went as near as politeness and expediency would permit to repudiating his words. The very frankness with which the Indian Secretary announced from the first that the Government did not care to hear or mean to hear reason about Candahar had something refreshingly straightforward about it. In replying to Mr. ASHMEAD BARTLETT on Monday night, Lord HARTINGTON made a statement which was of some gravity. It has more than once been remarked how unlucky it is that public questions of great importance should fall into the hands of private members who, excellent as may be their intentions, fail somehow to convey to the House a sense of that importance. Mr. ASHMEAD BARTLETT's speech on this occasion, whatever its merits may have been, contained a very great deal of matter which was well worth the attention of the House. The House, however, would not attend to it, and Lord HARTINGTON's task was easy. Had Sir CHARLES DILKE been the respondent, he would probably have confined himself to availing himself of this want of attention and fencing the question. Lord HARTINGTON, however, while making some fair personal and political points, spoke with unexpected gravity on the recent and threatened Russian encroachments on Persia and Afghanistan. The out-and-out asserters of the principle that nothing which happens in Central Asia concerns Great Britain must have been a little disconcerted at Lord HARTINGTON's plain statement that the Akhal annexation was not a matter of indifference to the Government; that the question of the integrity of Persia is still less indifferent; that an advance of Russia towards the borders of Afghanistan "might not be of advantage to the good relations of 'Russia and England'; and that the whole subject was under the consideration of the Government. This, translated out of Ministerial and party language, more than justifies what has been said by the Jingoes, the alarmists, the Mervous persons, at whom certain political partisans are never tired of sneering. It would be, of course, too

much to expect that Lord HARTINGTON should admit that at least some of the things the gravity of which he so fully admits are the obvious and direct consequence of the evacuation of Candahar. It would be still more unreasonable to expect that he should trace the new Afghan trouble to the same source. Nevertheless, that the evacuation was as much the direct cause of these events as the battle of Sedan and the siege of Metz were the immediate cause of the subsequent events of the Franco-German war is simply certain. It was because these results were clearly foreseen, and for no other reason, that the evacuation was objected to in these columns. It seems absolutely impossible for some persons to dissociate the question from abstract theories as to the best frontier of India, absolutely impossible for others to dissociate it from political prepossessions about the conduct of Lord NORTHBROOK or Lord LYTTON. Both these proceedings are merely examples of the apparently incurable habit of looking at anything rather than the facts. Those who did look at the facts can at any rate assert, without fear of contradiction, that everything has happened exactly as they predicted.

#### ENGLAND AND AMERICA.

IT is uncertain whether the English and American Governments have entered into any correspondence on the subject of the murderous Fenian plots. The object would perhaps be more effectually attained by semi-official representations than by formal exchange of despatches. The discovery of the infernal machines which were landed at Liverpool a few weeks ago seems to have produced a considerable impression in the United States. Respectable journalists have ceased to sneer at the supposed suggestion that the Federal or State Governments should "do the 'police work of England.'" It is not the business, nor is it within the power, of the English police to deal with preparations for murder which may be made on American soil. It is possible that there may be no sufficient legal remedy, for it is only within a few years that the atrocious doctrines of Nihilists, Fenians, and other gangs of assassins have been openly professed or even suspected to exist. It assuredly is or ought to be a crime of the greatest magnitude to employ the resources of mechanical skill and chemical knowledge to the production of machines for the express purpose of destroying persons who are probably unknown to the artificer. The ruffian who lately boasted that his accomplices had blown up in the *Doterel* an unoffending ship's company, has since informed a newspaper writer, who was not ashamed to converse with him, that he would not think of causing an explosion in an Atlantic steam-packet which might have some of his own friends on board.

The efforts which have been made to trace the consignors or manufacturers of the clock machines seized at Liverpool have not been successful; for it is impossible to say whether the braggart statements of wretches who profess to be engaged in the manufacture of murderous implements have any foundation in fact. The inspection at the outports has probably become more minute. There was nothing in the appearance of the casks which contained the machines to excite suspicion; and it is probable that the merchandise was entered by the freighter under a fictitious name. The English authorities are not entitled to charge the American police with inefficiency. It seems to be impossible in England to keep secrets, even of the most vital importance. Newspaper agents pay high for intelligence, and some official of the humbler class appears always to be open to a bribe. There is something cynical in the uniform readiness of editors to publish news, even at the risk of thwarting the national policy or of preventing the discovery of crime. Three years ago a paper, friendly to the Government of the time, caused the Ministers the gravest embarrassment by printing a secret despatch which had been stolen by an occasional clerk from the Foreign Office. In time of war English generals have now, in addition to their other arduous duties, to keep watch over the Correspondents, who are always ready to disclose to the enemy through the press the most important information. It seems that the Government and the Liverpool magistrates were, with good reason, anxious to keep the secret of the importation of infernal machines as long as there was a hope of discovering the guilty consignee; but by some unknown channel the secret leaked out, and, as soon as the whole story appeared in the newspapers, all hope of a discovery was at an end. The HOME

SECRETARY was compelled to admit the truth of published statements which had already done all the mischief possible. While the matter was in the hands of the police, it is difficult to understand why the barrels were removed, instead of being left in the ordinary course of business to await the demand of the consignee. The inveterate sympathizers with revolution, who habitually vindicate or extenuate the outrages of the Land League, and who are consistently anxious to exonerate the closely allied Fenian conspirators, affect to believe that the infernal machines were made and sent for the purpose of producing alarm rather than of causing murderous explosions. A less skillfully constructed and less costly engine would have served the purpose. It is true that a main object of the conspiracy is to create terror; but one explosion would frighten timid politicians more than a dozen abortive attempts. By violence, or the apprehension of violence, the trustees of the Skirmishing Fund hope to bring the separation of Ireland from England within the range of practical politics. Their hopes will have been encouraged by Mr. GLADSTONE's recent declaration that a discussion on the concession of Home Rule was merely inopportune.

In the present temper of the American people, the police may be trusted to exercise reasonable vigilance for the prevention of shipments of explosive materials. There is, on the other hand, little reason to hope that the authorities will interfere with the incendiary publications which both aid in the collection of funds for the Land League and announce that the independence of Ireland will be best attained through the use of dynamite in England. A wholesome jealousy of interference with the free expression of opinion is combined in the United States with a national tendency to strong and inflated language. Public speakers who would not willingly be held responsible for the literal meaning of all their rhetorical flourishes read even the most violent language with a tolerance which is founded on a latent suspicion that it is insincere. Although Fenian exhortations to crime have again and again been followed by fresh outbursts of villainy, American politicians are loth to connect the result with the cause. Some apologists for inaction remark with truth that the literature of assassination is not studied by respectable citizens, who, indeed, might read the *Irish World* without the smallest risk of their becoming accomplices in crime. The preachers of murder ought to be restrained, if only for the reason that they address actual or potential murderers. Although Fenians and Nihilists would not be admitted into respectable private society, they are personally regarded with a tolerance which seems to Englishmen strange. The would-be regicide HARTMANN, whom Mr. BIGGAR held up as a model to be imitated in England, seems to be openly agitating in the United States. O'DONOVAN ROSSA announces that he will wait on the PRESIDENT after his recovery, and that he will appeal to the sympathies of Congress. It is not forgotten that some years ago Fenian delegates were formally received by the House of Representatives.

The English Government has acquired a right to protest against unlimited license of publication by the remedy which was after the ORSINI attempt applied to a defect in the law. The prosecution and conviction of the incendiary MOST proved that it was legally possible to comply with the requirements of international comity; yet it is impossible to compel the Americans to provide security against incitements to murder. If Lord GRANVILLE has suggested to the SECRETARY OF STATE remedial legislation, he must acquiesce in the refusal which will probably be given. Further pressure would only cause popular agitation; and dislike to the pretensions of England would in some cases take the form of sympathy with the promoters of assassination. English Governments have often in not dissimilar circumstances given offence to Continental rulers. A nation which never attempts to protect its own highest functionaries from vituperation and calumny is naturally indisposed to legislate for the benefit of foreigners. At the present time it is especially desirable to abstain from proceedings which might cause a reaction against a spontaneous movement in the right direction. The crime of GUILTEAU has caused not only general reprobation of political murder, but a strong disposition to trace the outrage to its causes. Although GUILTEAU is an isolated offender, and not the agent of any faction, a strong impression prevails that he might, perhaps, not have ventured on his enterprise but for the violent attacks which had been lately made on the PRESI-

DENT by a section of the Republican party. It matters little for the present purpose whether the conjecture is well founded. The existence of the suspicion proves that those who share it have learned to understand the connexion between inflammatory words and criminal acts. A Russian regicide could not have chosen a more inauspicious occasion for his visit to the United States than at the time when the PRESIDENT has not yet recovered from the wounds inflicted by an American HARTMANN. The distinction between Kings or Emperors and Republican Presidents has been obliterated by the hand of GUIEU. The universal indignation which was felt in England on the perpetration of the crime may perhaps strengthen the growing disposition in America to discourage murderous conspiracies. A continuation of the outrages perpetrated and threatened would produce a feeling against Irish residents in England which might have serious consequences. The mere habit of blustering about crimes of the worst description is in a high degree demoralizing. For the distress and alarm which must necessarily be caused by even vague threats of assassination, the miscreants of the Fenian press and the Skirmishing Fund have no consideration.

#### THE LAND BILL.

IT would be interesting to know what were the real thoughts of the noisy partisans who have lately been threatening and abusing the House of Lords as they read the debates on the second reading of the Land Bill in the Upper House. The remarkable advantage in point of business-like aptitude, no less than of intellectual and oratorical ability, which the present House of Lords has over the present House of Commons could hardly have been better shown. In the protracted debates on the Bill in the Lower House a singular reluctance or a singular inability to display anything like a grasp of the measure has prevailed. On the Opposition side, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. SMITH, and, in a less degree, Mr. PLUNKET, fought the losing battle with remarkable ability and perseverance; but on the side of the Ministry there seemed to be a *mot d'ordre* that no one but Mr. GLADSTONE was to say anything of importance. Whether the principle was the same as that which precluded loyal subjects in old days from unmannerly interference with their sovereign's pleasure and prowess in the chase, or whether the silence resulted from that secret dislike to the measure which, as Mr. SMITH assures his constituents, prevails as much on one side of the House as on the other, it is impossible to say. But the fight was as languid as it was long. Great praise has been given to Mr. GLADSTONE's conduct of it, praise which is perhaps rather more generous than discriminating. That conduct brought to mind forcibly a rule of the game of whist, which will be sought in vain in the code of MESSRS. CLAY and BALDWIN, but which is said to prevail in some Continental regiments. At each deal the colonel names trumps after looking at his own hand. Mr. GLADSTONE's enormous and obedient majority gave him a somewhat similar advantage in proposing, dropping, adding, and altering the provisions of the Bill exactly as might best suit his convenience or his wishes. The energy which enabled a man of his age, burdened with much other work, to go through such weeks of labour, can hardly be too much admired. But conduct and generalship were hardly needed. The House of Commons with which Mr. GLADSTONE had to deal would have passed the Koran or the Nautical Almanac as a Land Bill if he had bidden them to do so, and the knowledge of the fact naturally took all spirit out of the unreal fight.

It has been insinuated that the battle in the Lords was equally, if not still more, unreal, and that the brilliant speeches of LORDS SALISBURY, LANSDOWNE, CAIRNS, and the Duke of ARGYLL were mere beatings of the air—elaborate arguments for rejection, winding up with a lame and impotent conclusion of acceptance. That nothing can be further from the truth is sufficiently obvious. The Peers are statesmen, if their critics are not, and they have to consider the consequences of their action. The proved unwillingness or incapacity of the Government to deal with Irish anarchy throws a frightful responsibility on those who give them the occasion of once more displaying that unwillingness or that incapacity. It would be the duty of the Peers not to shrink even from that responsibility, if there were the slightest chance of mending matters.

There can hardly be said to be that chance. The state of terror in which the Whig members of the House of Commons are held has been sufficiently proved, and the general attitude of the country toward the Bill is one of sullen and unfriendly acquiescence. The commonplaces of demagogues have such a mischievous charm in them, that, in case of a general election being held to decide between the Lords and Mr. GLADSTONE, it is by no means sure that unintelligent resentment at the interference of the Peers might not confirm the tottering allegiance of the majority of the constituencies to the present PREMIER. The possibility of a dangerous agitation in England as well as in Ireland is therefore involved, and unfortunately the proof that there are persons of the highest position ready to avail themselves of any such agitation is recent and unmistakable. There is, therefore, nothing to do but to shorten sail and wait for better weather. For it must be remembered that, unlike most so-called reforms, the Land Bill is in its nature a step backwards, not a step forwards, and as such is retrievable. In the very possible contingency of its landing Ireland in a deadlock of litigation, rack-rent, and economical entanglement, a return to the Saturnian principles of free contract and common sense may be as ardently desired by the next generation of tenants as a departure from those principles is desired by the present. Every successive change in social and commercial relationships which has ever been permanent has been in one direction, and there is no reason for believing that Mr. GLADSTONE will be any more able to mop back the ocean than any one of his illustrious predecessors in the attempt.

This being the case, it may be hoped that the wisdom which has already furnished a clear and exhaustive criticism of the measure as it stands will leave it to work weal or woe unhampered and unmutilated. All that needs to be done is to redress the most obvious and definite injustices and inexpediencies. There is no need to go the cynical length of advocating the retention of the worst parts of the Bill in order that it may do as much harm as possible. Some amendments are not merely legitimate but necessary. The propositions of Lord SALISBURY, of Lord CAIRNS, of the Duke of ARGYLL, and, in a somewhat less degree, of Lord LANSDOWNE, show a complete comprehension of the situation, and would go far towards making the measure an economical experiment rather than a simple carrying out of the motto "Stand and deliver." Lord CAIRNS's amendments, in particular, show that knowledge of the facts of Irish land-holding which is not denied even by the most hostile critics, and which in the Lower House was notoriously not possessed by a single influential member on the Government side. Lord SALISBURY's deal rather with such defects as are obvious on the face of the Bill. The Duke of ARGYLL's are the most drastic of all; and it is perhaps not superfluous to point out that the Opposition cannot be fairly charged with any difficulty that may arise from them. But the Duke of ARGYLL's improved form of Mr. HENEAGH's proposal, and of the proposal for protecting those landlords who have bought up the tenant-right; Lord CAIRNS's check on collusory sale; and Lord SALISBURY's removal of the present limitation on the landlord's right to go into court—a limitation as contrary to public policy as to justice—are all of the class of amendments which the Lords may justly insist on. Hardly as much can be said of the omission of the words specifying the two interests in Clause 7, for these words, objectionable as they are, are of the essence of the Bill. On the other hand, the Opposition were wise in refusing to introduce the comparatively unimportant, and probably vexatious, restriction for which Lord EDMUND FITZMAURICE had stood sponsor in the Lower House. There are some minor points, moreover, in which the known business ability of the Upper House may fairly set straight things left crooked and tangled by the complication of amendments of insertion and omission which takes place in Committee of the House of Commons. That there is room for such improvement even in the opinion of the Government, is evident from the numerous amendments which stand in the name of the LORD PRIVY SEAL. But it seems of vital importance that the alterations made should be kept down as much as possible. To speak the plain truth, it is the principle of the measure, and not its details, which is objectionable and dangerous. If it is necessary, as it certainly is necessary, in the public interest to swallow

the camel of the three F's, it is idle to strain at gnats in the shape of years and pounds, rights of turbary, and rights of digging for minerals. In the same way it may be argued that the hands of the Court should be left as free as possible. No conditions which can be inserted in the Bill as it stands will prevent the Commissioners, if they are prejudiced, from giving effect to their prejudice, and none are necessary if they are not so prejudiced. On the whole, it would be impossible to define the difference between wise and unwise amendments better than was done by Lord CAIRNS at the conclusion of his admirable speech. This is not a case where it is wise to ask for more than the asker is prepared to take. The amendments which the Lords determine on introducing should be few, should be clear, should manifestly not run contrary to the general principles of the Bill, should be such as are obviously required by the plainest reasons of justice and expediency. That there is room for amendments of this kind is certain, and the Peers will be supported by public opinion in proposing them. Most of the alterations which have hitherto been carried seem to keep this principle in view very fairly. But to "potter" with the Bill is in every way undesirable. The sooner it is allowed to go its way, and the more thoroughly it is allowed to do its work, the greater will be the chance of the people of England opening their eyes to its real meaning. Nor should the renewed agitation in Ireland be left out of the question. "The Moors have heaven and "me," says ALMANZOR. The Peers have the laws of the universe and MR. PARRELL. At present the member for Cork is playing their game vigorously; it would be a thousand pities if they by any mistake should play his.

#### EUROPEAN COMBINATIONS.

EXPERIENCED observers of political affairs pay little attention to rumours of constantly shifting combinations supposed to be arranged among the Great Powers. When at long intervals alliances are made for purposes of aggression or defence, positive compacts sometimes modify the policy which would be in any case pursued; but, on the whole, it is the safest course to assume that every Government will be guided by considerations of its own special interest. Apparently authoritative statements which contravene the general rule almost always prove to be erroneous. A few months ago the determination of Greece to go to war with Turkey for the frontier defined by the Berlin Conference was affirmed by an overwhelming mass of respectable testimony; but the sceptics who declined to believe that so gross an act of folly would be perpetrated found their calculations justified by the result. The same test may be advantageously applied to the diplomatic activity of more important States. Governments which have for the time nothing to gain by an adventurous policy are not likely to entangle themselves in alliances for facilitating aggression. The League of the three EMPERORS which was at one time actually established was accepted by Germany for the purpose of preventing an understanding between Russia and France which might have become dangerous. Nevertheless, after the lapse of three or four years, the League was tacitly dissolved, notwithstanding the dynastic intimacy which united the Courts of Berlin and Petersburg. When Prince GORTCHA-KOFF seemed disposed to resent the secession of Germany from the League, Prince BISMARCK at once formed a more natural, and apparently a more permanent, alliance with the Austrian Government. The close union of the two central Empires is the best guarantee for the peace of Europe; and consequently any change in the present arrangement would cause general uneasiness. There is no reason to fear that the allies will voluntarily engage in a war of conquest. It is strange, but true, that no other combination among Continental States would be deemed equally innocuous.

Alarmists, if the name may be applied to habitual prophets of evil who are not always mistaken, have lately discovered or suspected a meditated adhesion to the alliance of Austria and Germany on the part of France. Such a combination would undoubtedly justify the anxiety which a belief in the rumour would create. At present the story rests on no sufficient evidence; and it is in itself highly improbable. The origin of the report may probably be traced to the approval or indifference with which Prince BISMARCK is known to have regarded the French

attack upon Tunis. It may perhaps have been a mistake to have felt complacent satisfaction at the engagement of French forces in a remote enterprise which threatens no German or Austrian interest. To other politicians the temporary withdrawal from adventurous undertakings of the Power which has for centuries been the most turbulent in Europe had seemed a ground for unqualified satisfaction. That French vanity should once more have been aroused by a trivial conquest is not an insignificant fact; nor can the wisest statesman foresee the results of the complications in which the French Government is already involved. In the first instance, England, Italy, and incidentally Spain, have been the only adverse critics of the policy which M. ST.-HILAIRE has alternately disavowed and defended. It is not Prince BISMARCK's habit to interfere with quixotic generosity for the protection of the interests of other States. A coldness between France on one side and England or Italy on the other would perhaps not be unwelcome to the German Government. It is not probable that any French Ministry would begin to extend the national territory in Africa, if it had any immediate purpose of attempting the recovery of Alsace and Lorraine. There is a wide interval between acquiescence in the African aggrandizement of France, and complicity in projects for disturbing the peace of Europe.

A newspaper Correspondent has lately taken the simplest method of gratifying public curiosity by seeking interviews with Prince HOHENLOHE and M. GAMBETTA, and asking them whether a tripartite alliance has been formed or contemplated. Statesmen in modern times are not in the habit of expressing surprise at such inquiries; but they exercise their diplomatic skill in giving as little information as possible, except when publicity serves their own purpose. The interview with Prince HOHENLOHE led to the important statement that such an arrangement was possible, but that, if it had been made, it was still a secret. An indefinite answer was the best way of dealing with an impudent question. M. GAMBETTA was so far more communicative that he repudiated any knowledge of the ruptured compact; but he was not less mysterious than the German Ambassador in giving his opinion as to the probability of an alliance. Even his disclaimer of knowledge of the fact was qualified by the statement that he seldom saw the FOREIGN MINISTER, though he admitted that the alleged transaction could scarcely have occurred without being brought under his notice. The journal which represents his opinions has since made a violent and scornful attack on M. BARTHÉLEMY ST.-HILAIRE. Some of M. GAMBETTA's further remarks were not uninstructive, though they contained no special information. An alliance, as he justly remarked, would only be made for the furtherance of some policy in which the three Powers were jointly interested. A chronic or permanent alliance by which the independence of French policy would be limited seemed to M. GAMBETTA neither desirable nor probable. The sound distinction which he draws would account for the uneasiness which the rumour has caused to those who believe it to be true. A confederacy of Germany, Austria, and France will never be formed for peaceable or defensive purposes. The conclusion of such an alliance would imply a foregone determination to engage in some aggressive undertaking. On the whole, and as a general rule, M. GAMBETTA desired to retain for France entire freedom of action, with the contingent advantage of being ready to profit by any opportunity. His further expression of a belief that international policy would hereafter be regulated by the concert of Europe, seems, if it is correctly reported, to be incompatible with his system of political independence. Whenever the Great Powers, or some of them, fall out among themselves, the concert of Europe, which principally affects minor States, is for the time suspended.

The frequent complaint of the isolation of England represents, as far as it is well founded, the inevitable result of well-known circumstances. In the late Turkish negotiations all the Powers co-operated harmoniously with England. It is only when questions of territorial readjustment in the heart of the Continent occur that the wishes of England are likely to be left out of consideration. A Power which always desires peace is not a probable ally in the prosecution of ambitious designs, nor are the comparatively small military resources of England forgotten by potentates who dispose of gigantic armies. It is indeed not a little surprising that the Power which is both most unwilling to disturb

the peace and least capable of engaging in wars of conquest is treated with the deference which English Ministers still command. It is impossible to regard with satisfaction the unstable equilibrium of European peace. There was far more security against war during the forty years which followed the fall of NAPOLEON. In the early part of the time the half-fabulous Holy Alliance was too much disposed to interfere for the suppression of popular revolutions. The French invasion of Spain in 1823, and the previous occupation of Naples by Austrian troops, were in themselves wrongful acts, but they led to no serious disturbance of the general peace. It was understood that a majority of the Great Powers would combine against any one of their number who should disturb the existing settlement. In 1840 Lord PALMERSTON effectually checked the ambitious projects of France by uniting the other five Powers in opposition to M. THIERS's Eastern policy. The place of the old European concert is inadequately filled by temporary combinations which are at all times liable to be disturbed. The tribunal of the Great Powers has not ceased to exist, but its functions are changed, and it confines itself to such operations as the settlement of frontiers between Turkey and Montenegro or Greece. The principal security against war is now the enormous cost in men and money of military operations. The masters of colossal armaments are afraid to set them in motion.

#### EGYPT.

SIR CHARLES DILKE, in answer to a question put by Lord BECTIVE, stated that the English Government had received no application from the KHEDIVE for assistance in case of a revolt, and that, so far as was known in London, no such application had been made to the French Government. That there should have been any occasion to ask such a question would seem extraordinary to any one who had not followed the recent course of Egyptian history. To those who have followed it nothing could seem more natural than the question of Lord BECTIVE. There is some danger of a revolt in Egypt, and if the revolt broke out, it would be of a kind which it would need aid from without to suppress. The Egyptian army is in a very disorganized state; and, if its want of organization went a little further, it might cease to be organized at all, and become a band of disaffected insurgents. That an army should get out of hand, and be ready to turn against its nominal employers and chiefs, is a serious thing in any country. But in Egypt it would be a very serious thing indeed. For in Egypt there is not the smallest element of resistance to a disaffected army. There is the KHEDIVE, and a few foreign Pashas, and a population which would not stir a finger to protect itself, or its country, or its Sovereign. There is a sprinkling of foreign residents, all civilians, full of jealousies and suspicion as regards each other, and without any common centre, tie, or principle of action. There is nothing like an army within the army, a portion of the military force that can be set against the rest, faithful regiments ready to share the fate of their master, like the Russian regiments who saved the dynasty at the time of the accession of NICHOLAS. The KHEDIVE has no Janissaries, and it is doubtful whether he has even a bodyguard whom he can trust. If the army revolted, it would probably revolt in a body, and would do whatever its accepted chief or chiefs told it to do. It might in a few days make itself master of the whole country without a struggle. It only consists of about fifteen thousand men, and neither the private soldiers nor the officers have any knowledge of military matters or any experience of war. But fifteen thousand men, with arms in their hands, compose a powerful force when no one else is armed, and it does not require much military knowledge to threaten or shoot down people who do not and cannot resist. A military revolt in Egypt would have as certain a prospect of success as the instigators of such a revolt could wish for, if they had only Egypt itself to think of. But those who might be inclined to head such a revolt know that they have not only Egypt to think of. Punishment might come from London or Paris or Constantinople, but it would come from some quarter outside Egypt, and sooner or later they would themselves be shot, and, therefore, all things considered, they do not think it worth while to revolt.

But recent events have shown that there are at present grave reasons for regarding the Egyptian army with

anxiety. These reasons go back for some distance of time. The present KHEDIVE has now been just two years Khedive, and he was made Khedive because the protecting Powers got his father deposed, and ISMAIL was deposed because he set himself to shake off the Protectorate, and the beginning of his attempt to make himself independent was his getting rid of the NUBAR-WILSON Ministry by rousing his soldiers against them. The soldiers had something substantial to complain of, for they had received no pay for nearly two years; but they would have borne their hard lot with the habitual submissiveness of Orientals, had it not occurred to ISMAIL that they might be used to free him from a Minister who, in his eyes, was the symbol of foreign supremacy. It was suggested to the soldiers that it was NUBAR PASHA who was keeping them out of their pay, and giving to foreigners what was due to them. They mobbed this treacherous Minister, and then the KHEDIVE, instead of upholding the man whom he had entrusted with authority, coolly observed that the incident showed that NUBAR had not the confidence of the population, and that he, as the father of the country, could not keep in office a Minister whom the country wished to see dismissed. A vivid sketch will be found in Mr. DICEY'S volume of the long-suffering or meekness with which the protecting Powers accepted this deliberate challenge of their authority. Scene after scene succeeded, interesting enough, but mostly with an interest of a comic kind. At last the KHEDIVE was deposed, and accepted his deposition like a lamb. Even had he wished to resist, he could not have relied on his army. It is a peculiarity of the Egyptian army that it is never of any use to any one. It had just renewed its oath of fealty to him when he was deposed, and with perfect indifference it renewed its oath of fealty to his successor. Things got better in Egypt, and means being found to pay the army, everything went on pleasantly till the early part of this year, when the Egyptian officers thought that they would like to improve their position, and asked for the dismissal of some Turkish and Circassian officers, to whom, as they alleged, all the best things were given through the favouritism of the Court. Three of the ringleaders were arrested, and then the regiments with which they were connected marched to the prison where these officers were confined, released them, and, finding no one to oppose them, began to instruct the KHEDIVE as to what he had got to do to content them. They did not, however, begin with the KHEDIVE, but with the French Consul, M. DE RING, who, in a vein of effusive good-nature and lordly superiority, treated them as the best of injured men, threw over his English colleague and the KHEDIVE, and told them all the great things he, as representing their true friend France, would do or get done for them. For this monstrous piece of indiscretion he was subsequently recalled by his Government. Mr. MALET, the English Consul-General, behaved in these difficult circumstances with much firmness and discretion. He would do nothing apart from the KHEDIVE, but in conjunction with the KHEDIVE he got the men to make a nominal apology, and to say that they would trust the KHEDIVE to redress any grievance of which they justly complained. But they had tasted power, and could not get the taste out of their mouths. Since then the army has asked and obtained one concession after another. It asked that the Minister of War should be dismissed, and he was dismissed. It asked for higher pay, and got it. It then asked that it should be allowed to elect its own officers, and even this astonishing demand, which brought to an end anything like discipline and control, received a humble assent. It seems to have now taken into its head that it would like to recast the Civil Service, so as to place tame and unmeritorious people in a proper degree of subordination to the gallant defenders of their country. The army is, in fact, within a point or two of governing Egypt. It has asked and got so much that it sees no limit to what it may get further by asking.

When an army gets into this state of anarchy, there is no effectual remedy except to disband it. Egypt has no occasion for an army at all. What it wants is a small, effective gendarmerie. Much money would be saved to Egypt, and a source of serious danger to the KHEDIVE and the country averted, if the army altogether ceased to exist; and, as there is probably not a soldier in the army who has not been made to serve by being torn away by force from his village, the men might be not unwilling to go

to their homes. But they are very unlikely to go quietly if they are made to go; they will probably follow their officers blindly, and the officers are very much interested in not allowing the army to be disbanded. How, then, is the disbanding of the army to be begun, and still more how is it to be finished? An army flushed with repeated triumphs, and having put the weakness of the Government to tests of increasing cogency, is not to be dispersed unless there is some one to say that it must go. In Egypt there is no one who can say this. The KHEDIVE cannot say it, the Ministers cannot say it, and the English and French Consuls-General cannot say it. An English or a French sergeant, with a dozen of his own men at his back, could say it, and the Egyptian army might melt away in a day. But there is no English or French sergeant in Egypt, and the KHEDIVE and the English and French Governments are equally reluctant to allow these forerunners of foreign armies to appear. If the KHEDIVE applied for military assistance to the protecting Powers, he would bid farewell to the possession of that fraction of independence which he retains, and to those hopes of a much larger measure of independence which he is known, or, at least, is commonly believed, to cherish. Neither the English nor the French Government would allow troops to be sent by the other without insisting that troops of its own should go too. A joint military occupation would lead to the most serious complications, and would strain, to a very dangerous extent, the relations, which are already somewhat precarious, between the two Governments. The resource of asking the Porte to intervene remains; but it has long been a maxim of both England and France that Turkey shall not be allowed to interfere in Egypt. It would be very difficult to get the Turks out if they once got in, and there would be a constant rivalry at Constantinople as to which Power should exercise the greater influence in determining what the Turkish troops in Egypt were to do. If there really was a military revolt in Egypt, the protecting Powers would probably find they had no choice, and must put it down. It is the perception that this must be the end of a revolt that for the present averts it. But the reluctance with which the Powers would interfere, and the still greater reluctance with which the KHEDIVE would see their interference, prevents any precautions against a revolt being taken, and has prompted the acquiescence of all parties in concessions being made to the army, which, if followed by the still greater and more dangerous concessions which are demanded, or are sure to be demanded, must end in a revolt or in Egypt being subjected to a military despotism of a very vulgar and pernicious type.

#### LORD SHERBROOKE ON BANKRUPTCY LAW.

LORD SHERBROOKE has never been wanting in the courage which leads men to attack conventional ideas; and now that he is untrammelled by the thought either of office or constituents, this virtue has the freer course. The shield which he has last struck is Bankruptcy Law—bankruptcy law with no definite article prefixed to it and no limitation to this system or that, but bankruptcy law in the abstract. Lord SHERBROOKE cares nothing about refined distinctions between one bankruptcy law and another. They are all bad. Each in turn has had its special vices, but not one of them has developed any special virtue. The law which existed down to the beginning of the present reign was illogically hard upon men who were unable to pay their debts. It made an exception in favour of traders, and thus created the system which has since attained such tremendous proportions, but it rigidly shut out every one else from this solitary harbour of refuge. This distinction has long disappeared. To be made a bankrupt is now the right, under certain circumstances, of every subject of the QUEEN. Unfortunately the extension of this right, whatever it may have done for debtors, has done nothing at all for creditors. Two plans for distributing the bankrupt's estate have been tried in succession, and neither has answered the end which its framers had in view. In the first instance the property was handed over to officials. "The army of bankruptcy," says Lord SHERBROOKE, "was complete in all its parts, and the very model of a perfect and well-ordered department." Its single fault was one that "in no degree injured the symmetry of this splendid system." It was merely that "a great deal of money went into it, but very little came out." At length the creditors grew disgusted

with the poverty of the result, while the Government of the day were shocked at the dishonesty of the method employed to attain it. The bankrupt's estate was now handed over to the very persons who had most interest in making it yield the largest possible dividend. "It seemed as if the riddle had been at last read, and the working of a bankrupt estate was about to take its place among the exact sciences." The fault of this reasoning was that it treated the creditor as a man moved by only one set of considerations. It is true that he wants to save as much as he can from the wreck, but it is also true that he does not care to spend much time over a process which must at best be uncertain. More than this, he is a little ashamed at his own want of judgment in trusting a man who has failed. "He does not like to pose as an unsuccessful man, still less as a man who has been taken in," and the effect of his dislike is that he puts the whole business from him, and leaves the bankrupt's estate to be appropriated by any one who will relieve him of the trouble of getting it in and distributing it. The person most willing to bear this burden is usually the dishonest trader—acting of course by an agent. "The bankrupt flourishes, and the creditor loses his dividend, under the influence of a false psychology."

The Government now seek to revive the system under which the bankrupt's estate was dealt with by a court. Lord SHERBROOKE makes some passing criticisms on the details of Mr. CHAMBERLAIN's Bill, but he naturally feels but a languid contempt for a measure which, from his point of view, has no right to exist. He has, indeed, a short way of dealing with bankruptcy, but it is not one that can be called a bankruptcy law, except in so far as that name can be given to a statute which would simply repeal all previous statutes and set up nothing in their place. Lord SHERBROOKE's doctrine is that in bankruptcies the creditors are just as much in fault as the debtors. The debt could never have been incurred unless the credit had been first given. "As every man is free to keep his money in his pocket if he pleases, in judging of such transactions moral considerations are quite out of place, and no intervention of penal law is demanded." When the creditor comes to Parliament with a demand to be avenged of his debtor, Lord SHERBROOKE would have him told that it is his own fault that the relations of debtor and creditor ever grew up between them. The creditor was not compelled to lend the debtor money, or to trust him with goods. He did so because he thought that the transaction would yield him a profit. Among the elements which entered into his calculations was, or ought to have been, the probability that the debtor would repay the money or give him the value of the goods. It is as much the creditor's business to estimate the value of this probability as it is the debtor's business to estimate the chance that the money or the goods which he has had advanced to him can be laid out at a profit. Lord SHERBROOKE declines to see any difference between the two cases, or to recognize any right in the creditor to recover from the trader the loss which his own folly has brought upon him. To make this process legal is "to punish the borrower because you were so imprudent as to trust him." Consequently, he would repeal the existing bankruptcy law and enact no new one. He would shorten the period within which debts can be recovered, and during the continuance of that period he would leave creditors to enforce payment on the principle of first come first served.

If a commercial code were being drawn up for the first time there would be something to be said for Lord SHERBROOKE's suggestion. The surest way to avoid bad debts is to have no debts at all; and, in proportion as the means of recovering a debt become fewer, the temptations to allow one to be contracted will become less. Probably, if there had been no machinery provided for the distribution of a bankrupt's estate, the great body of creditors would not have been appreciably poorer. The money has been effectually disposed of, but very little of it has come into the right hands. But creditors who have been brought up in the hereditary conviction that it is the business of the law to protect them against their own want of judgment in determining whom to trust cannot be expected, in the absence of conclusive experience, to display this sublime common sense. When the failure of a particular method has been demonstrated they may be willing to abandon it; and not a single voice has been raised in defence of the system which the Government propose to abolish whenever

they can find a spare Session for the purpose. The unfitness of the creditors to distribute a bankrupt's estate has been demonstrated; on that point, therefore, they retain no misleading hopes. But, as regards the unfitness of the Government for the same work, no such conclusive proof has been supplied. Why should it be impossible for lawyers and officials to administer a bankrupt's estate with as much honesty as they bring to bear upon an infant's estate? No one accuses the Court of Chancery of eating up the properties which it has to control, and there is nothing in the nature of things to make the Court of Bankruptcy less scrupulous. The failure of a single experiment is not enough to convince creditors that the end to which that experiment was directed is unattainable. If it is thought expedient in the interests of the commercial community to entrust the ministers of justice with the division of the debtor's estate, there may be some means within our reach of preventing these ministers from appropriating the lion's share of the property to themselves. If such means exist, there is a reason for not abandoning the search for them, of which Lord SHERBROOKE takes no notice. Even if the system which would abolish bankruptcy by abolishing debt is abstractedly the best, we may still be anxious that the Government should not at once plead guilty to the charge that it cannot ensure that its ministers shall be decently honest. There is another reason which should make us hesitate before taking Lord SHERBROOKE's advice. He argues as though the one object of a bankruptcy law were to prevent bad debts from being contracted, and in order to do this he is willing to go the length of discouraging debt altogether. Is it to the interest of a mercantile community that he should have his way in this respect? So long as debt is the word employed, the answer to this question may appear extremely simple. So many commonplaces have been uttered as to the benefits of ready-money payments that we can hardly hope to get beyond their influence. But what if the word credit be substituted for the word debt? Here we at once come within the range of a set of rival commonplaces. If debt has been the object of unqualified blame, credit has been the object of equally unqualified praise. Yet the two terms refer but to one transaction. Credit cannot exist without debt; and if credit is the very life of trade, debt has an equal title to be so described. Lord SHERBROOKE claims for his plan the merit of making trade safer and therefore more profitable. He may not perhaps have given sufficient weight to the fact that the dimensions of trade as well as its security must be taken into account when calculating gains.

#### THE TRANSVAAL.

THE Convention which has been concluded between the Commission and the representatives of the Transvaal Boers is apparently reasonable; but the most satisfactory circumstance in the transaction is that it has been found possible to make any kind of settlement. The Triumvirate, if it had not been disposed to act in good faith, might have inferred, from the manner in which the war had been terminated, that the English Government would be disposed to abandon any of its demands in preference to the risk of another rupture. It is true that there is still a considerable English force in the neighbourhood of the Transvaal; but, except for purely defensive purposes, it would have been almost impossible to resume hostilities. There was a much better reason for fighting at the moment when the armistice was suddenly announced than there could be at any later time; and the Boers might have taken it for granted that obstinacy could expose them to no worse danger than that of postponing the final evacuation of their territory. For these reasons the late reports of dissensions between the Commissioners and the Boer leaders seemed not incredible. It was said that several articles of the proposed Convention had been rejected by the Boers; and a personal objection raised by the Commissioners to the intervention and presence of one of the Dutch negotiators seemed likely to create serious difficulty. The terms which have been now arranged fall far short of the conditions which were contained in Lord KIMBERLEY's instructions; but it was not desirable to insert stipulations which would almost certainly have produced future dissension. If the summary which has been published is accurate, many delicate questions relating

to the natives within and without the Transvaal must have been by common consent passed over in silence. Only last week Mr. GLADSTONE was understood to state in the House of Commons that the English Government would exercise a protectorate over the Transvaal natives through the agency of the Resident. It was at the time pointed out that such a division of power would be wholly inconsistent with independence; nor, indeed, had Lord KIMBERLEY definitely suggested to the Commissioners so anomalous a scheme. Mr. GLADSTONE appears to have correctly anticipated the mode in which the Convention would deal with the natives beyond the frontier. The whole controversy seems, in the opinion of both parties, to have been finally exhausted, for it was believed that the territory of the Transvaal would be handed over to the Republican Government at the beginning of the present month. It is nevertheless agreed that the Convention shall not be valid until it is ratified by the Crown and by a Volksraad to be summoned for the purpose. The English ratification will be easily obtained; but grave complications might arise if the popular Assembly were to repudiate the arrangements of the Triumvirate. The contingency is happily the less probable because the English troops are not to evacuate the territory before ratification. It is also agreed that, if the Volksraad rejects the treaty, the English sovereignty is to revive.

The provision that all State property, except munitions of war, taken over at the time of annexation shall be transferred to the new Government is probably not of practical importance. The State Treasury at that time contained only a few shillings; but there may be a few modest public buildings properly belonging to the Government which may at any time be established. It is less easy to understand the declaration that the English Government will pay for damage caused by the troops and the Republic for damage caused by the Boers. Private claims, confined to cases of injury, are to be subject to the final award of three persons named in the Convention; and indirect claims, such as those which might be founded on depreciation of the value of property, are rightly excluded. The Boer Government is to assume liability for the debt to the estimated amount of 400,000*l.* It is not stated whether, in case of default, the creditors, who will not be gratified by the substitution of a new security, are to be indemnified by the English Government. Mr. GLADSTONE's statement as to the relations of the Suzerain with the natives in the Transvaal may perhaps have referred to a body called the Native Location Commission, of which the English Resident is to be a member. As the President or Vice-President of the Republic and another representative of the Boers will always form the majority, the influence of the Resident will probably be nugatory. Native location seems to mean that the natives may hold land, but it is expressly declared that they can only acquire a title through the Commission. If the Boers choose to exclude the natives from the possession of land, the protests of the English member of the Commission will have but little effect, yet it is barely possible that the natives may derive some advantage from the advocacy of their claims by one of the Commission. The functions of the Resident are strangely defined as corresponding to those of a Consul-General. As it is of the essence of consular authority that it should be exercised in a foreign dominion, it seems strange that the powers of an officer who will represent the Suzerain should be compared to those of a functionary whose duties are confined to protection of the interests of his countrymen under an alien Government. It may be admitted that the objection is mainly theoretical. After the restoration of independence, it became impossible that an English Resident should possess, in ordinary circumstances, the political authority which is associated with the title in the native States of India. One important right is, nevertheless, reserved to the representative of the Suzerain. In time of actual or apprehended war between the Suzerain and any foreign State or native Power, the Resident will be entitled to move troops through the territory of the Transvaal. He is also to have exclusive control over external relations; and it is clear from other articles of the Convention that native tribes beyond the frontier of the Transvaal are included among foreign communities. It is expressly provided that the independence of the Swazies shall be recognized; SECOCOENI and his followers are to be liberated; and the boundaries of their location are to be defined. It was unnecessary, or perhaps useless, to refer to

the Zulus ; but they are not unlikely to give trouble. A pretender to the succession of CETEWAYO has raised a considerable force ; and JOHN DUNN had asked the permission of the English authorities to resist his attempts.

The rights and property of Englishmen settled in the Transvaal are protected, as far as verbal stipulations form a security. Those of them who have actively exhibited loyalty to the English Government will, if the terms of the Convention are observed, be guaranteed in the enjoyment of civil rights, including possession of property. English-speaking citizens of the Republic will have no technical claim on the good offices of the Resident ; but, if they are unjustly treated, they will probably be able by his means to communicate with their former Government, on which they have a strong moral claim. English subjects living in the Transvaal will be under the protection of the Resident in his consular capacity. It is not improbable that disputes will hereafter arise as to the allegiance of Englishmen whom the Republican Government may claim as citizens. A double or doubtful nationality is, in imperfectly civilized countries, not unfrequently a convenience. English subjects will be exempt from compulsory military service, and they are to bear no burdens beyond those which are imposed on the citizens of the Republic. The Boer Government may perhaps hereafter refuse to recognize the privileges of permanent settlers who may desire to retain their English allegiance ; but it is useless to anticipate complications which can scarcely be anticipated in framing a diplomatic or legislative instrument. By a valuable article of the convention it is provided that no differential duties shall be imposed on English produce. The Volksraad might, if it thought fit, enact a protective tariff ; but under the treaty it must accord to England the privileges of the most favoured nation. It is not likely that, at least for the present, the Republican Government will impose duties, except for purposes of revenue. The governing part of the community consists of rich freehold farmers, who will not be exposed to the competition of foreign agricultural produce ; and they have no disposition to engage in manufacturing industry. Any industrial enterprise which may be attempted will probably be undertaken by adventurers from the English colonies, who will exercise no political power in the Transvaal. The guarantees against nominal or real slavery are, as far as words go, complete ; and it is possible that a definite prohibition of all practices of the kind may be more or less operative. No other part of the Convention will have so strong an interest for a large and respectable class in England ; and it is probable that the professed opponents of slavery will be but imperfectly satisfied. The alleged kidnapping of children, and the domestic servitude which is disguised under the name of apprenticeship, have been long maintained in defiance of domestic laws and of the treaty under which the independence of the Transvaal was recognized. The crimes which have been committed may perhaps have been exaggerated, but the existence of compulsory servitude has been fully proved. The Boers may perhaps have at last learned that none of their institutions or customs is so likely to cause future infringements on their independence.

#### COMPETITIVE EXAMINATIONS.

THE system of substituting competitive examination for patronage is too firmly established, is too popular with the public, and too welcome to those who without it would have to bear the distasteful burden of patronage to permit any thought of its being abandoned. With all its drawbacks, it may also be said to do more good than harm to the general education of the country. For the most part the conduct of the system is in the hands of the Civil Service Commission, and it is impossible to overrate the zeal and intelligence with which the Commission sets itself to do justice, to bring out what is best in the best candidates, and to bring good sense to check the abuses to which the system is always exposed. But the system is becoming a very far-reaching one, and raises questions which are outside the particular mode in which the examinations are themselves conducted. One of these questions was started on Wednesday by Mr. Gorst in a discussion on the selection of naval cadets. The last Government did away with the system of entrance by competition which it found in existence when it entered office, and had recourse to pure nomination, subject to the

nominee being able to pass a test examination. The object of this change was not to get more patronage, but to prevent mere children being subjected to the strain of excessive and premature work. The present Government has returned to the kind of competitive examination which prevailed when Mr. GLADSTONE was previously in office. The competition is not open, for only those candidates can try who have received a nomination permitting them to compete. For each vacancy three or more little boys are allowed to compete. The object of the limitation is a purely social one. It is intended to prevent any lad becoming a naval officer whose parents are not in a position to have some means of getting at the First Lord. But this opens so wide a field that patronage properly so called is in abeyance. An influential parent does not think it worth while to use his influence merely to get his child the right of going into an examination in which he is sure to be beaten. One of the worst effects of the patronage system is also avoided. The patron is subject to such extreme pressure from influential people that he not only fills up vacancies in accordance with their wishes, but is very apt to invent vacancies in order not to disappoint them. It is to the artificial creation of vacancies in this way in past times that the present block of promotion in the navy is largely owing. Under the present system there is no pressure of this special kind. All that the First Lord is asked to do is to put a candidate on the list for examination when a vacancy happens in the natural order of things, and he and the candidates wait until a vacancy occurs.

But, for the very reason that the competition is wide enough to do away with the evils of patronage, it is also wide enough to carry with it all the evils of competition among children. What these evils are needs no explanation. It is a bad thing for the body and mind of even a clever little boy to be stimulated by the eagerness to obtain a prize, and to be taxed by the concentration of much work into a little time. Mr. TREVELYAN said, in reply, that it was quite possible so to conduct the examination that a candidate shall not succeed by what is generally called cramming. It may or may not be a popular delusion that there is a secret art possessed only by crammers which enables them to foresee what questions will be asked, and to teach stupid boys exactly how to answer them. Perhaps after all the house of a crammer is only a school where there is little or no play, and where individual attention is given to each boy. But no secret art, as Mr. TREVELYAN remarked, can enable a little boy to translate, with only the aid of a dictionary, a piece of Latin which he has never seen before. The evil of the competition of children is not that they are induced to learn badly and superficially what they ought to learn well and thoroughly, but that they learn twice as much as they ought to learn in a given time. What is to be said in favour of the naval competition is that it is only a drop in the ocean of general competition which is going on, whatever may be the system of appointing naval cadets. All the innumerable scholarships by which little boys are admitted to a privileged position at a public school are stimulants to overwork which throw the tiny stimulant of naval competition into the shade. Every year the number of these scholarships increases, because a school that has no scholarships cannot attract the amount of clever little boys which, for its own well-being and repute, it desires to have. Nor is it at all difficult to invent scholarships ; for it is easy, under some faint disguise, to tax the stupid boys for the sake of the clever ones. A slight and unnoticed contribution from the many provides for the few. Nor is it easy for parents who are indifferent to the money to allow their boys, if clever, to keep out of the stream of premature competition. The master of the school for little boys naturally concentrates his attention on the boys who are going in for scholarships, and who will do him credit, and the boy who is not to be sent in for a scholarship thus misses the best teaching that the school can give him. The whole system of scholarships at public schools for children, of scholarships at the Universities for lads, and of prize fellowships for young men, hangs together, and influences the tone and character of modern English education much more powerfully than the substitution of competition for patronage.

The only question that remains open is the age up to which children shall be protected against competition. If parents liked it, there seems to be no reason why the masters of private schools should not generally institute

entrance scholarships into their admirably conducted homes. The parents of the stupid boys would be delighted to find the money if some little disguise, such as that of giving two eggs at breakfast instead of one, was adopted; a child of nine would win the great SMITH Scholarship, while a lesser child who had, perhaps, been prevented doing full justice to himself by a sudden flood of tears would occupy the tamer but still honourable position of *Proxime Accessit*. With what fond triumph would a doting mother explain to a lady friend that her JOHNNIE was within a pockethandkerchief of being the SMITH boy of his year. Fortunately, early education is still to a large extent under the control of parents who do not need pecuniary assistance, and who shrink from seeing a promising boy blighted by early success. The chiefs of the navy, at any rate, can fix the age at which the children for whom they are responsible shall compete. Mr. GORST wished that the competition for the navy should be entirely open; but then he also wished that the age at which the competition took place should be postponed, and that cadets should have finished their schooling and be ready to go to sea when they were appointed, instead of, as now, being kept after their appointment on board the *Britannia*, which is really nothing more than a particular kind of school. The difference between limited and open competition for the army and navy is almost nominal, for as long as the necessary preparation is as expensive as it is now, few poor men can get their sons in, and as long as officers find it difficult to live on their pay, no sane poor men would wish to get their sons in. As to postponing the date of entrance, Mr. TREVELYAN was really in accord with Mr. GORST. But he urged that the system of beginning the naval education of cadets when they were little boys had always been the English system. The first navy in the world has always caught its future officers when they were just out of the nursery. It is a standing belief in the profession that it is because the officers were thus taken that they have played their part so admirably, and Mr. TREVELYAN will not take on himself to say that the belief is unfounded. He thinks, however, that the schooling they receive might be condensed into a much smaller space of time than is given to it at present; that in a year and a half it might be finished, and that then the boys might be sent to sea, and allowed to forget their books. From this the transition to accepting them when they have done their schooling seems not a very difficult one.

#### THE FRENCH ELECTIONS.

THE sin of the French Government in taking the electors by surprise has already been forgotten. When an election is only three weeks distant there is no time for quarrelling over any question which is not important enough to affect the result. Even those who have said the strongest things against Ministers for anticipating the contest by a lunar month cannot affect to think the act so serious that the judgment of the country must be taken upon it. From that point of view it is so much surplusage, and as such it has been promptly put aside. The result has been to leave the field of controversy a little barren. There is no positive issue before the electors. The Extreme Left will look for one either in the abolition of the Senate or in the separation of Church and State; but there is no chance that either question will have an appreciable share in deciding the complexion of the next Chamber of Deputies. The Senate enjoys the great advantage of being elected by a very large constituency. It is true the process is an indirect one. But the election even of a delegate has its interest for those who take part in it; and every peasant in France would probably feel that he had lost a means of making his wants known if there were no longer a great Council of the communes in the return of which he might bear his part. It is a further difficulty in the way of a revision of the Constitution which should have for its object the abolition of the Second Chamber, that unless the process is to be effected by revolutionary methods the Senate must be consenting to its own death. It must vote for the convocation of the Congress in which the question is to be raised. There is no reason to suppose that the Senate is possessed by any such suicidal tendencies. Upon this proposal, at all events, the Conservative Senators might com-

mand a substantial majority. Nor is there anything to indicate that the country is disposed to adopt the violent courses which can alone make the consent of the Senate an unnecessary adjunct to a constitutional change. Whatever the electors may think of the institutions under which they are for the time living, they have apparently no wish to see them violently upset. As regards the separation of Church and State, the electors are equally well satisfied with things as they are. They have not been in the least offended by the measures already taken against the Church, for they have no love for monks, and no objection to see their neighbour's liberty restrained. But they seem equally without any desire to see the attack carried further, and they would probably dislike having the alternative presented to them of doing without religion altogether, and paying for its offices out of their own pockets. To all appearance, therefore, the character which the Extreme Left will try to give the elections will only be affixed to it in the large towns. The party will hold its own in the new Chamber, but it will not be appreciably strengthened.

No doubt this conclusion will have to be greatly modified if M. GAMBETTA should make either of these questions his own. After the utmost possible allowance has been made for the essential conservatism of the French peasantry, M. GAMBETTA's personal popularity remains a substantial fact, and his accession to any party must be an immense temporary gain to it. M. GAMBETTA's declaration in favour of the revision of the Constitution or the abolition of the Concordat would certainly secure the return of a much more Radical Chamber than the present Republic has yet seen. It is probable, however, that this result would be brought about rather by omissions to vote than by votes. The electors who felt that M. GAMBETTA had disappointed them would not support the candidates he recommended, and they would not have the time in which to make up their minds to support Opposition candidates. They would fall back, therefore, upon that constant weapon of French political discontent—abstention. The Chamber would be Radical, but it would be a Chamber representing only a minority of Frenchmen. There is no present reason, however, to suppose that M. GAMBETTA contemplates any such change of policy. Undoubtedly the rejection of the *Scrutin de liste* and the composure with which the action of the Senate has been received by the country have placed him in a position of some difficulty. He has, in effect, offered himself as the leader of the Moderates; the Moderates have refused, not exactly to be led by him, but to be led by him on his own terms; and yet he cannot for ever remain poised, like MAHOMET's coffin, between the Moderate and the Extreme Lefts. But there is reason to believe that M. GAMBETTA is too thoroughly convinced that the French people are at bottom anti-revolutionary, and that any politician who credits them with any different sentiment is certain, in the long run, to have his mistake brought home to him, to be tempted into further identifying himself with the Radical party. He will trim his sails to the last moment so as to catch their support; but, when the last moment comes, he will steer away on his separate course. Whether he will succeed in getting together a working majority without a more positive declaration of policy than he seems at all anxious to put out remains to be seen; but, so far as his plans can be divined from the *République Française*, he is hopeful on this head. The business of the electors, says this journal, is to create on the 21st of August a Governmental majority. They may do this by going backwards or by going forwards. They may strengthen either that section of the Moderate Left which approaches most nearly to the Left Centre or that section of the Advanced Left which approaches most nearly to the Moderate Left. Translated into practical language this is an exhortation to give the preference to candidates supported by the group which calls itself the Republican Union. If the electors follow this advice M. GAMBETTA will no doubt consent to take office whenever it is offered him, and as soon as this fact is understood it will probably not be long before M. FERRY is invited to efface himself as the pleasanter alternative to being effaced. If, on the other hand, the electors return a Chamber which is scarcely distinguishable from the actual Chamber, it is not easy to foretell the result. On the principle that like causes produce like effects France would be delivered over for another four years to the same succession of weak Ministries which she has seen for the past two years and a half. It seems scarcely possible, however, that M. GAMBETTA would run the risk of thus

overstaying his market, and he might be forced to formulate a policy and trust to its acceptance by the country to convince M. GRÉVY and the Senate of the need of a dissolution.

It is quite possible that the almost unnoticed existence of Prince NAPOLEON has had an important share in determining M. GAMBETTA to take office whenever the Republican majority can be brought into line. For a time it seemed doubtful whether he looked forward to being Prime Minister or to being President. In the latter case he would certainly have laboured for a revision of the clauses in the Constitution which make the President irresponsible, and vest his election in the two Chambers sitting as a National Assembly. M. GAMBETTA would hardly care for the form without the reality of power, and a President cannot have the reality of power unless his claim to call himself the representative of the nation is as good as that of the Legislature. A position similar to that enjoyed by a President of the United States is one that would have many attractions for an ambitious Frenchman, but if it is only to be gained by direct popular election the chances of successful rivalry must be taken into account. It can scarcely be doubted that if France had now to elect a President by universal suffrage, M. GAMBETTA would be returned either unopposed or by an enormous majority. But if M. GAMBETTA were to fail in the exercise of power, Prince NAPOLEON might be a formidable competitor at the next Presidential election. When a nation has to decide between one man and another, there is no room for the cross intrigues which give an element of uncertainty to the best arranged election of representatives. This at all events is the one end which Prince NAPOLEON thinks worth striving for. In his letter to the committee formed for keeping before the electors the paramount importance of restoring to the people its inalienable right of appointing the President of the Republic and the Senate, he declares that he accepts the duty imposed on the heir of the NAPOLEONS by so many popular votes—the duty of demanding that the French people shall elect their ruler. In the interests of the Republic M. GAMBETTA is probably wise in declining to make this demand his own; and the only alternative to doing so is to call upon the electors to make a strong Ministry possible.

these miscreants proceed. The case for the prosecution dealt chiefly with the pursuit of the men who had been seen by a constable in the act of placing the bag which contained the bomb against the wall of the Town Hall. For the purposes of conviction this was a point of the utmost moment; but its importance was at an end as soon as the conviction had been obtained. All that could be discovered as to the antecedents of the prisoners was that they had been living in Liverpool for two months, that they had made the bomb in their lodgings, and that one of them was the agent of a paper of O'DONOVAN ROSSA's, while the other had occasionally spoken of his connexion with the dynamite propaganda in America. There is nothing in all this to suggest any new precautions against similar outrages. Except in so far as the news of the sentences passed on M'GRATH and M'KEVITT may serve to warn off imitators, we are no more secure now than we were before they were tried.

The prospect is one that becomes more unpleasant the more steadily it is looked at. Probably, indeed, the intellect of O'DONOVAN ROSSA and his friends is not quite equal to their wickedness. And this consideration suggests a large percentage of failure to a small percentage of success. But even this small percentage of success may do us irreparable injury. The destruction of the Liverpool Town Hall or the Houses of Parliament would be only a question of money. But there is no certainty that the designs of these American Irish would be restrained by aesthetic and historic considerations. They would pull down Westminster Abbey or burn the National Gallery, and do so all the more readily if they had wit enough to realize that the injury they were inflicting was beyond reparation. They have not hitherto shown much skill in bringing their machines into position, but in this respect they may be learning wisdom from experience. At all events, it is not safe to assume that their blunders will be repeated as often as their crimes. It appears, too, that they are making great improvements in the construction of the machines which they employ; and it is obvious that increased perfection in this respect adds not only to the destructive force of the instrument, but to the security of the man who applies it. It is very much easier and safer to fix a bomb which will explode by clockwork six hours after it is wound up than to fix one which at once begins to smoke in a way that betrays what it is designed to do. No ordinary amount of watchfulness can ensure a public building against this kind of attack. There must be an absolute cordon drawn round it within which no unknown person is allowed to move about except where he can be watched by the police on duty. Even if buildings of extraordinary national value can be protected in this way, there is no reason to think that the ingenuity of their assailants would be exhausted. The destruction of human beings is as much an act of warfare as the destruction of so much brick and mortar; and a clockwork bomb, placed over-night in a market, might be set so as to explode with tremendous effect at the busiest moment of the morning. The loss of the *Doterel* shows how effectively these new machines may be employed if a member of the Society happens to be for a short time a seaman in the QUEEN's service. He has only to desert or to get leave as soon as he has set his clockwork for a certain hour, and the catastrophe follows almost inevitably, while he himself apparently incurs no danger. It does not much matter whether any alternative explanation can be suggested in this particular case. The facts are quite consistent with the hypothesis of Fenianism; and, though O'DONOVAN ROSSA may be lying when he claims the deed as his own, there is nothing to show that he is not speaking the truth. When we read such ravings as those extracted by the *Standard* from O'DONOVAN ROSSA's journal, it may at first seem idle to treat them seriously. The description of the trial and sentence of Mr. GLADSTONE, with its interlarded capitals, resembles nothing so much as the proceedings of that famous society of which SIM TAPPERTIT was president. The slow rising of "one of the Directors—he holds an important position in a wholesale importing house in New York," the record in blood-red ink in the secret book, the calling up of the "GLADSTONE death motion" at a later meeting, the stern and determined looks, the deeply breathed "Ay," the low burning gas, are precisely the incidents which DICKENS would have borrowed as more humorously appropriate than anything he could possibly have invented to the dark designs of his spindle-shanked apprentice. Unfortunately there is another side to the business. The actors in

#### THE LIVERPOOL FENIANS.

THE conviction of M'GRATH and M'KEVITT for attempting to blow up the Liverpool Town Hall may make it somewhat more difficult to find agents for the execution of the Fenian designs against England. The members of the Society which has passed sentence of death on Mr. GLADSTONE, and cherishes a peculiar hatred to English public buildings, profess to be altogether indifferent to what may befall them in their own persons. It is allowable, however, to doubt whether this impassive attitude will, in all cases, be maintained in presence of a possible sentence of penal servitude. Among the Russian Nihilists the case is different. They seem really to forego every chance of escape, and to be content to perish themselves, provided that they can ensure that their enemies shall perish with them. But the Russian Nihilists have had a very different measure of provocation dealt out to them. They live in a society which is rich in permitted abuses, where criticism even of the mildest kind has long been prohibited, and where the punishments awarded are proportioned rather to the temper of the Government at the moment than to any consideration of the nature of the crime. Here are all the elements which engender reckless violence, but there is not one of them which is present among the American Fenians. They cannot themselves be sufferers under the Irish land laws, for both the principals and the agents are ordinarily residents in the United States. They have not as yet been prosecuted for any of the incitements to murder which daily appear in their newspapers, and the two men convicted at Liverpool on Tuesday are the first who have tasted the useful severity of the English criminal law. There is some reason to hope therefore that in disabusing M'GRATH and M'KEVITT of the notion that a bomb can be placed against the wall of a public building without any risk to the amiable enthusiast who makes himself the instrument of his country's vengeance, Mr. Justice LOPES and the Liverpool jury have done a real public service. Unfortunately, the trial led to no disclosure of the system upon which

this scene may intellectually and morally be hardly higher than unusually mischievous monkeys; but science has armed them with extraordinary powers. One of the ghastliest murders in fiction was the work of a manlike ape who had accidentally got possession of a razor, and no limit can be set to the disasters that may conceivably be wrought by ape-like men who have got possession of dynamite.

What is to be done in such circumstances as these? It is proper, no doubt, to urge upon the United States Government the importance of making diligent search for the makers and exporters of these machines, and it is so completely their duty and their interest to comply with our representations that no doubt can be entertained of the result. But it is equally proper and more useful to bear in mind how very little any Government can do to prevent a crime which consists in the manufacture of machines, one element in which is in itself quite innocent, while the other admits of being conveyed in a hundred different ways. If dynamite could only be hidden in cement barrels, it would be easy enough to search every barrel before it was put on board. In that case, however, it would be easier still to examine every barrel before it was landed, and there would be no need to ask the United States Government to do the work of our own Custom-house officials. But dynamite need not be concealed at all. It may be imported in a thousand seemingly harmless shapes, and have its equally harmless little clockwork movement affixed to it after its arrival. It is eminently an affair in which we must help ourselves. If the enemy cannot be defeated in England, there is little chance of his being defeated on the other side of the Atlantic. How he is to be defeated here is a more difficult question, especially as the method which first suggests itself is one to which Englishmen have a great and natural distaste. It is the men who import these machines, not the machines themselves, that we must try to get at, because if these men could once be filled with a sense of constant insecurity, they would probably be less willing to offer their services to the Society which sits at home at ease in New York while they are risking their liberty, if not their lives, in England. If the Habeas Corpus Act were suspended in the case of all persons suspected of being mixed up with these dynamite enterprises, the Government would at least be armed with a power which would be useful, because it would be mysterious and uncertain.

#### COSMIC EMOTION.

AMONG other reasons for not getting rid of the Christian religion we do not remember that Swift mentions the difficulty of providing a cheap substitute. The innocent Freethinkers and fribbles of his time were likely to be more influenced by the fear of losing a standing butt of men of wit. But now the various sets of advanced people who agree on only one topic—namely, that Christianity is played out—are in reality rather an affecting quandary. They are by no means men of wit—indeed, they all resemble each other in a singular lack of the sense of humour. They are extremely respectable, their intentions are excellent, and they are persuaded that a cheap substitute for Christianity is what advertisements call “a felt want.” It is not the simplest thing in the world to start a new religion—a thing that has never yet been done without considerable discomfort and self-sacrifice on the part of the founder. Yet cheap substitutes are offered on every side. While these rarely seem satisfactory to the mere Philistine, with his blind and bigoted attachment to exploded Dagons, still less does each inexpensive substitute command the respect of the friends of some other mixture. Possibly the inventors of Hedozone and of Zoedone entertain no lofty opinion of the rival liquors, and the patentees of the last new thing in shoddy butter has probably a settled conviction that oleomargarine can never really satisfy human yearnings at breakfast.

An eloquent paper of Mr. Frederic Harrison's in the August number of the *Nineteenth Century* aptly illustrates these professional rivalries. Mr. Harrison is an agent for the Religion of Humanity, and a friendly periodical admits that he despises cosmic emotion and pantheism even more than he contemns the creed attributed to St. Athanasius. We confess that we know but little of cosmic emotion considered as a substitute for Christianity. It is very difficult for a plain man to keep up with the march of religious invention in this prolific age. The new religions succeed and do not resemble each other. A few years ago we had Miss Cobbe, determined to be creative and constructive, determined, as Emerson says, to brace us with affirmations, and not to leave us among barren negations. Miss Cobbe's religion, and that of other creative and constructive geniuses, was compared by Mr. Arnold to the British College of Health, “which does credit, perhaps, to the resources of Dr. Morrison and his disciples,

but falls a good deal short of one's idea of what a British College of Health ought to be.” In fact, the new churches were merely very tiny dissenting chapels, and certainly fell short of a high and perfect ideal.

To remedy this fault, it is probable that various new religions have been started, and have waned away like flowers that blush unseen. We confess that, if it had not been for Mr. Harrison's eloquent and destructive criticism, we should not have been aware of the existence of cosmic emotions—by the way, a recent poet spells cosmic with a K, which gives the thing more than ever the air of something patent you might buy at a speculative barber's. From what Mr. Harrison says, it is plain that cosmic emotion is one of the things that a certain set of people think it necessary to “get.” In serious coloured circles, in America, the one thing necessary is to “get religion.” In Boston, U.S., some people “get” dynamite; others addict themselves to “getting culture.” Cosmic emotion, at least in this country, is most readily got by going out on a fine night and viewing the starry firmament. “Then,” says Mr. Harrison, “the exhausted spirit feels almost on the threshold of immensity, and half believes that each instant the heavens are about to break open to their highest, and those human eyes are about to know the reality of the Unseen. We have all known that moment,” adds Mr. Harrison, perhaps too sweepingly, and he goes on to observe that “we have lain down with a delicious void in our hearts.” That void, if we are not mistaken, is cosmic emotion. But, as Mr. Harrison observes with force and truth, the sensation of a delicious void, and all the other sensations which precede and accompany it, are not religious. “Is it enough to guide lives, to curb passions, to give light to despair, unconquerable force to societies, nations, races?” Plainly a void, however delicious, cannot do that, and if only religions can do that, cosmic emotion is not a sufficient basis for religion. Here it may be observed that, if Mr. Max Müller's theory of the origin of tree and river and mountain worship is correct, these forms of religion had their source in cosmic emotion. Early man felt a sense of awe and mystery in the view of trees which were ever so much more high than he, and lived ten times as long. Rivers and hills impressed him in much the same way, so he took to worshipping these phenomena. If this theory were correct (and it must be remembered that Mr. Spencer's theory is quite different), cosmic emotionalists would be returning to the religious condition of the ancestors of the race.

Mr. Harrison brings various arguments against the disciples of the religion of cosmic emotion. That emotion is apt, it appears, to result in a kind of sentimental optimism, a vague general belief that “the All” is all right, “a very big thing,” as Mr. Harrison reverently says, and a conviction that things in general will “come round and be all square,” as some one says in *Bleak House*. Mr. Harrison points out that there is nothing in the aspect of the Cosmos which gives grounds for this opinion. “Waste, ruin, conflict, rot are about us everywhere.” They are, indeed. Beauty and harmony do not have it all their own way “in those regions of space where they tell us suns explode and disappear, annihilating whole solar systems at once.” Thus “the All,” though distinctly “a big thing,” as Mr. Harrison tells us, is certainly rather mixed. Rot is about us everywhere. And, even where the world is beautiful, it owes that beauty, Mr. Harrison says, chiefly to man. Poets have taught us to enjoy it. Practical agriculturists, landscape gardeners, and others have trimmed and adorned it. “The flowers, the forests, the plantations, the meadows, the uplands waving with corn and poppies, are the work of man.” Is all this quite scientifically correct? Some evolutionists aver that the credit of creating flowers is due to birds or butterflies; we are not certain which, but we incline to butterflies. The forests, again, are they the creation of man? Mr. Gladstone can fell a tree, but can he make one? Who planted out Australia? Certainly not the unconstructive race whom the first European voyagers found there. The Alps, the snow, the rainbow, too, are beautiful; but we do not understand the sense in which they can be called the works of man. Mr. Harrison has too dogmatically got rid of the old theory that “God made the country and man made the town.” But Mr. Harrison is craftily leading up to the doctrine which is to supersede cosmic emotion. “The earth was a grisly wilderness till man appeared,” and that is a gentle introduction to the recommendation of the Religion of Humanity.

The arguments against cosmic emotion have been stated. Nothing comes of it, it does not lead to anything, it cannot direct or inspire society, and it is based on the misconception that there is a good deal of beauty not created by man, and that beneficent law is present, and ultimately victorious in the universe. Mr. Harrison asks what good can come of “any of these sublimities” at moments when, in old days, religion was invoked? What do the fatherless and the widow care for sunsets? Will the debauchee be converted by the sweet influences of the Pleiades? When the enterprising burglar is not burgling, does he really care to hear the pleasant rivers run? When “the demon of anarchy is gnashing its fangs at the demon of despotic cruelty,” is he moved to sweet solemn thoughts by the contemplation of Orion? No more than the chambermaid, according to Mark Twain, is moved by the idea of a future. As cosmic emotion cannot do what it is the main business (according to Mr. Harrison) of religion to do, as it cannot improve daily life, where are we to look for a substitute? Why, to the Religion of Humanity.

Thus we find Mr. Harrison taking his stand on the old controversial ground of curates in conflict with sceptics, of Mr. Mallock

in controversy with Positivists. People will not be good unless they believe what I believe, say Mr. Harrison and the curates. What Mr. Harrison believes in is life for others. "Whilst one mother struggling to save one child were left on this mere fleck of dust in the countless procession of the suns, the devotion of that poor creature to her offspring, the love and trust of her child for her protecting parent, have a deeper religious meaning than all the music of the spheres, or the mystery of the cosmic forces. There, where these two are cowering together in trust and love, there are still *life for others*, labour for others, endurance for the sake of something not our own, a sense of reverence and gratitude for protection, conquering pain and leaping over death. And if we are to seek the sources of religion, the ideal of religion, in the rushing firmament of suns, or in the withering waifs and strays of humanity, who are yielding up their last breath in mutual trust and love, we shall have to look for it in them [i.e. the withering waifs], for we can find it only in humanity, and in the world around us as the sphere and instrument of humanity."

Mr. Thackeray found it necessary to warn his childish readers, after some remarks of King Valoroso, that "blank verse, I need not say, is not argument." Nor is the eloquence of Mr. Harrison. According to that writer, the world was a grisly wilderness before the arrival of humanity. But the cave-bear, we believe, preceded the advent of humanity. And it is absolutely certain that a she-bear, if deprived of her cubs, displays all the emotions in which Mr. Harrison finds the sources, and apparently the sanctions, of religion. If all men and women were dead, and only a maternal Polar bear, her cub, and a wolf were left on this mere fleck of dust in the countless procession of the suns, and if that wolf attacked that bear-cub, the devotion of the she-bear to her offspring, and the confidence of the offspring in the she-bear, would be as deeply religious as ever. Humanity has nothing to do with the business. Religion, on this showing, is as old as the maternal instinct in pterodactyls and rhyphophagons. Thus humanity is not so peculiarly worshipful as Mr. Harrison would have us suppose. And, even if we accepted his religion of humanity, where is its practical force? The demon of anarchy who gnashes his fangs, as Mr. Harrison says, at the demon of despotic cruelty, is very likely a believer in the religion of humanity. But he goes on gnashing his fangs all the same. Or, if you choose to try the debauchee with the religion of humanity, will he be more moved than he was by the procession of the equinoxes? Not he. He will point out to Mr. Harrison that humanity is no more universally beautiful than the Cosmos at large, and, even when he finds beauty, he does not regard it in a religious and prayerful spirit. Humanity we have always with us, its influences are ceaseless throughout life, and it by no means interferes with the operations either of the demon of anarchy or of the gluton and the cheat. In fact, good people will be good, and bad people bad, and both will find irreligious excuses or religious sanctions for their conduct, while the world stands. The general idea of humanity influences, and will influence, perhaps even a smaller number of people than are morally affected by the conclusions they choose to draw from "cosmic emotion."

#### NORTHAMPTON'S PRIDE.

THE last reported words of Mr. Bradlaugh on the 4th of August, a day ever memorable in the annals of freedom, are reported to have been "at any rate Northampton should feel proud." It is not often that we find ourselves in agreement with Mr. Bradlaugh, but on this occasion we are disposed to think that he was quite right. Northampton by electing and re-electing him has shown distinctly the kind of man it wants, and the kind of performances it wants from him. The town of shoemakers must be very hard to please if it is dissatisfied with the performances of Wednesday last. "It is hard," the Northamptonians may fairly argue, "to secure a really distinguished representative; one who is obviously and eminently first in his own line. We have done this. We have got a member who is ready to present to the House of Commons identically the same appearance as that which an excited person of the opposite sex presents occasionally in the streets or at the door of a public-house. Like her, he screams and scratches, hustles and collars. As in her case, it takes a vast numerical superiority of force to overcome his gallant defence. Like her too, at least according to the authority of the revered Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, he ends in a dead faint. Now it is not every member who is prepared to reduce himself to the level of police-court virago, therefore let us be proud of having such a unique representative." Indeed, the only subject which might dash the pride of Northampton is the reflection that she might have had two representatives simultaneously hustling the police and collaring the messengers. A moment's thought, however, must show the men of Northampton that this is unjust to Mr. Labouchere. "He works his work, I mine," the sitting member for Northampton may say. Thackeray long ago pointed out that in the honourable profession of robbing there were diversities of operations. Only one man can actually win the money, others can look over the victim's hand, advise him to double the stakes, drive him down to the City to sell out, &c. So, too, even Mr. Bradlaugh requires a partner inside the House to argue the case, move resolutions, draw tears from the iron cheek of the senior member for Birmingham, and so forth. *Non omnia, &c.* The merit of Mr. Labouchere,

may be less shining than that of Mr. Bradlaugh, the parts he plays may have less action and dramatic force about them. But Northampton is justified of both her members, and ought to be proud of both.

London and England and the world have been copiously invited by Radical newspapers to weep for Adonais, to bewail the solution of continuity which manifested itself in his coat, and to drop the frequent tear over his broken stylographic pen. It is to be feared—and a perusal of Mr. Gladstone's oracle, the provincial press, makes the fear still stronger—that the world has declined to weep. If it does not laugh very much, it is simply because the comedy is of an extremely low order. If one of the aforesaid viragoes began to brawl upon any gentleman's doorsteps in ordinary life, he would send for the police, tell his servants to help them, and get her conveyed to her natural home—the police station—but he would not be much amused at the proceeding. That is what the Speaker did, except that, with politic or impolitic mercy, Mr. Bradlaugh was "left cooling" in a chair instead of being domiciled in Newgate. The House of Commons is, of course, to be sincerely commiserated in the matter. In public as in private life, it is always possible for a man or a woman who has little to lose to give a great deal of pains and annoyance to those who have much. It is certainly unpleasant for the House to know that Mr. Bradlaugh is prowling about with a tail of ragamuffins, and that at any moment there may be an unseemly squabble at its doors. The unpleasantness, however, is unavoidable so long as constituencies are sufficiently lacking in self-respect to send to the House candidates who have no business there. Mr. Bradlaugh's conduct is, of course, perfectly intelligible. He had lost his cause in the House of Commons, he had lost it in the courts of justice, he had lost it even before the very friendly tribunal of those Radical organs of opinion which were disgusted at his tergiversation in the matter of the oath. A bold stroke was necessary, and it has been very fairly successful. The remarkable intelligence of the before-mentioned organs has come to the conclusion that Mr. Bradlaugh's willingness to brawl and hustle at the door of the House is somehow a disgrace to the House itself. Mr. Bright—since Mr. Bradlaugh is not an Irish landlord—has felt his bowels of compassion moved over him; the seeds of a new agitation are sown, and the hand of the Government is once more forced. All this, of course, is exactly what Mr. Bradlaugh wishes. To persons of his stamp notoriety is in a good many senses the breath of life. Mr. Bradlaugh was losing this notoriety; he has regained it at the cost of a torn coat and a broken pen—no very high price to pay. The squabble of Wednesday has, it need hardly be said, absolutely nothing to do with the constitutional question at issue. The House of Commons, the courts of justice, and last, not least, Mr. Bradlaugh himself, have decided that at present no machinery exists whereby he can take his seat for voting purposes at the present time. If he can overthrow this decision by half throttling an usher and getting himself into an unseemly pickle, a new, short, and most efficient way to the House has certainly been pointed out.

To do the Government justice, their former conduct in the matter has rendered it almost impossible for them to do anything now without plunging themselves deeper in the mire. But they cannot be congratulated on their behaviour either *à propos* of Mr. Bradlaugh's Trafalgar Square meeting or *à propos* of the brawl in the Lobby. There was first the question of the Trafalgar Square meeting. That the Government were not within their discretion in refusing to prohibit that meeting we by no means intend to maintain. In the abstract there is no way of keeping the riffraff of a great city quiet more effectual than letting them "meet" just as they please. A few thousand roughs and *badauds* (the estimates of fifteen or twenty thousand which were made were, let us say in passing, a ludicrous exaggeration) might have jostled and howled, applauded Mr. Bradlaugh's windy platitudes, and cheered the mountebank garb of some of his influential supporters to their hearts' content anywhere else. But assemblages in the neighbourhood of the House of Commons for the purpose of intimidating the House of Commons are very properly forbidden by statute, and it was sheer absurdity on the part of the Home Secretary to pretend that this statute was not contravened on the occasion. "There is no ground," said Sir William Harcourt, "on which I can have authority to interfere with the meeting." There was every ground, as it happened, and as the event proved, the "distinct statements" on which Sir William relied, "that no one was to go to the House of Commons," turned out as valuable and effectual as might have been expected. No sooner was the meeting over than, what a friendly critic calls an "ugly rush," was made to the House, a rush which after all had to be driven back by force. On Wednesday the arrangements were effective enough, and it is probable that, if the "thousands of devoted men," as the same authority calls them, with their "passion-lit faces," and all the rest of it, had made their effort, they would have found the effectiveness to their cost. It is worth noticing, by the by, that Mr. Bradlaugh distinctly threatened violence. Whether he said that a force "within a million" was at hand to support him or a force "within a minute" does not in the least matter—the threat remains. There is, fortunately, not the least reason for believing that any attempt to carry out his threat would have any other result than the breaking of some heads which very well deserve to be broken, and the letting out of a little blood which is certainly not over pure. But if the Government (that is to say, the police) took efficient steps for the preservation of order outside, how was

it inside? They allowed one of their own number to offer a distinct encouragement to agitation for the purpose of overawing the House, to give a ludicrously inaccurate and coloured account of what had happened, and without disguise to take the part of perhaps the most flagrant offender against the privileges and dignity of Parliament who has ever been known in its annals of half a dozen centuries. It is certainly not too much to say that whatever good was done by Mr. Gladstone's not too enthusiastic maintenance of the Speaker's dignity, was undone by Mr. Bright's mischievous and reckless speech. As far as Mr. Bright was concerned, he was appropriately punished; to have laid oneself open to a well-deserved, unanswerable rebuke from Mr. O'Donnell is not an experience that any one can enjoy.

If it were not for the indecency of a bear-fight of this kind, and the mischievous use made of it by unscrupulous partisans, the whole thing would, of course, be absurd enough. Since the celebrated conflict on the Shannon shore, no tribune of the people has cut quite so sorry a figure as Mr. Bradlaugh. The comparison, too, does the Irish victim a good deal of injustice. Those who interrupted the mufins were, in his case, undoubtedly the aggressors, and they subjected the noble Smith O'Brien to unprovoked outrage. Nobody smote Mr. Bradlaugh on the nose on Wednesday, and his dilapidations were simply due to his own attempt to force the passage, and his struggles against the officials in the execution of their duty. A sympathizing reporter says that the victim of tyranny "instinctively selected the biggest man" to collar and throttle. It does not require much heroism to select the biggest man when you know that the biggest man has orders not to do you any bodily harm. The pathetic faint which so impressed Mr. Bright will scarcely produce an equal impression on those who have seen a naughty child in the "tantrums." A person of excitable temperament, who finds himself completely powerless, naturally gets into a very great rage, and this rage has often a considerable effect on him; but as only very foolish nurses suppose that the naughty child will do itself a mischief by screaming or stiffening, so it is only very foolish Chancellors of the Duchy who suppose that Mr. Bradlaugh's faint was deadly, or anything like it. The police, as we have hinted, have considerable experience of this form of hysteria, and they seem to have treated it in the appropriate fashion. Whether water, brandy and water, or sherry and lemonade was the restorative employed is a very interesting point which the future historian will have to settle. But at last the farce came to an end. Mr. Bradlaugh held what even his admirers call a not very dignified parley with Inspector Denning, in which, however, he seems to have acted with a good deal more dignity than when he tried to throttle the messenger, he sat on his chair, drank his water, heard that some two hundred members of the House of Commons had voted against him and seven for him, got into a cab, and drove to ask for a summons against the police. So with the inevitable speeches at the Hall of Science, interviewings, &c., ended day which was certainly disgraceful enough to himself and to the persons who supported him in and out of Parliament, but which cannot be said to have been disgraceful to anybody else. Some day, perhaps, it may be the law of England that, if a brawling stranger thumps and swears long enough at the gate of a house, kicks the butler, throttles the footman, and threatens the housemaid, he shall be admitted and have right of lodging forthwith. At present, however, there is no law to that effect, and Mr. Bradlaugh is, in virtue of a resolution of the House, which is supreme in its own cause, nothing more than a brawling stranger until he makes due submission and resumes such privileges as his incapacity to take the oath leaves him.

#### DR. PLUMPTRE ON MODERN SCEPTICISM.

THERE are many points of view, hopeful or desponding, controversial or conciliatory, tolerant or fanatical, from which a Christian believer may regard the altered relations of modern thought to the great struggle between faith and unbelief which, in some shape or other, presents itself in every age, and is perhaps specially characteristic of our own. Between those who simply exult in the "increasing purpose" that runs through the ages—and which seems just now to be running very fast—and the mere *laudator temporis acti*, who contents himself with unpractical lamentations over the *pietas* and *prisca fides* of a bygone age, there are many intermediate gradations; and some who are willing to rejoice that "knowledge comes" may still be tempted to regret that, in many cases at least, "wisdom lingers." In a paper contributed to the July number of the *Contemporary Review* Dr. Plumptre, with characteristic absence of any *mauvaise honte*, has essayed, within the space of nine pages, to review the entire present condition of the "Fields of Conflict between Faith and Unbelief." He observes indeed that, in the limits he has assigned to himself, his treatment must be "somewhat superficial." But dogmatic utterances are wont to be succinct; and Dr. Plumptre's theological lucubrations—whether in the form of letters, sermons, or review articles—have usually something of the grand air of an ecumenical and *ex cathedra* pronouncement. It will not, therefore, surprise any one familiar with his writings that he should include in this brief allocution, originally delivered at Sion College—which he "ventures to compare" to Bacon's *Advancement of Learning*—a bird's-eye view of the "scientific, critical and historical, and ethical" aspects of the rising controversy between

faith and unbelief, together with an elaborate preamble on the "general character" of the conflict. He considers—so far rightly—that the method of conducting it has become more civilized and courteous, which, however, is mainly due to the more refined temper of the day; and he is obliged carefully to limit this admission, in a footnote, to the leaders of the Secularist army, inasmuch as "the papers largely circulated among our working classes show that the rank and file contains at least many who are as savage and brutal in their utterances that they represent what may be best described as 'Condorcet filtered through the dregs of Paine.'" With this important limitation, however, the following remarks may be allowed to be substantially correct:—

The combatants do not enter battle as in the war-paint and with the war-cries of barbaric tribes, but for the most part in the temper of those ancient knights who before and after they fought with lance or sword exchanged their salutations of mutual kindness and respect. We seldom now speak of those who are unable to accept the faith of Christendom as an Infidel party. We use the term Theist rather than Deist, because the latter carries with it an offensive connotation from which the former is free. Though many men of science hold premises which logically lead to Atheism, no one, I suppose, except the junior member for Northampton, is called an Atheist. We do not assume that all unbelief must spring from immorality of life, or look on doubters or assailants as consciously enemies of truth and goodness. We do not back up our arguments with anathemas. There has been, I need scarcely add, a corresponding change on the other side also. The religion of Christ is no longer treated, as in the coarser unbelief of Voltaire and Paine, as the work of priestcraft, and its preachers as impostors. For the most part, though there are some exceptions, we find the character of Christ regarded with reverential admiration, and the Christian Church treated as an important factor in the history of European culture.

As examples of this modified tone among the assailants or critics of Revelation are cited the names of Renan, J. S. Mill, Greg, Strauss, Matthew Arnold, and Tyndall. And, in spite of the obvious retort of those who say *Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes*, the writer holds this change to be matter of rejoicing and thankfulness. Nobody of course will desire to recall the good old days when *putidissimus iste* was the mildest formula of reproach a Christian apologist could find for even his least hopelessly heterodox opponent, while a sceptic like Tom Paine was eager to inform the public how at the mature age of eight, after first hearing of the Christian doctrine of the Atonement, he "immediately went out into the verandah and revolted at it." But as regards the effect on the masses of this more civilized tone of sceptical literature, it is necessary to remember that the change does not penetrate far below the surface; and if, as Dr. Plumptre opines, no one but the junior member for Northampton is now called an Atheist, there are a good many more who do not shrink from the kind of language for which Mr. Bradlaugh has made himself unpleasantly notorious, and which we do not care to quote here. There is a further and very important deduction to be made from the religious value of the "fair words" proffered by sceptical assailants, which will be most conveniently noticed when we come to deal with the ethical aspects of the question.

Dr. Plumptre naturally begins with the scientific assault on the principle of "a supernatural Revelation attested by miracles." And here he is probably right in asserting that the "possibility of a miracle"—assuming of course the postulate of theism—is no longer generally denied; certainly Mill expressly admitted it. Nor is there any want of plausibility in the argument he repeats—and which has been forcibly dwelt upon by Cardinal Newman, though he does not say so—that, if there be a Deity, it is more likely that He would reveal Himself to His creatures than leave them unguided and unguided. But there is no inconsistency between this line of argument and that pursued in the very able "Bampton Lectures" of the late Professor Mozley—noticed at the time in our columns—as to the real meaning of the uniformity of nature, which Dr. Plumptre goes out of his way to disparage. That mere conventional interpretations of the language of Scripture are not likely to be pressed in this day by Apologists, against the legitimate claims of science, may be inferred from the appearance in a recent number of the *Dublin Review* of a paper from the pen of a Roman Catholic bishop of unimpeached orthodoxy, and well known to be keenly interested in geological inquiries, which treats the first chapter of Genesis as a magnificent poem. We cannot enter here on the vexed question of prophetic inspiration further than to say that Dr. Plumptre does not contribute very much to its solution—though he seems to think he has settled it—by clinching a very cursory antithesis of the twin functions of the old Prophets, moral and predictive, with the "pregnant words" of Bacon—in which Dr. Cumming and Dr. Colenso might have agreed—that "all prophecy hath springing and germinant accomplishments." As to the critical and historical difficulty, it is fairly enough summarized in the following passage:—

Sacred books have been examined with a microscopic minuteness. The external evidence has been weighed and declared wanting. Internal evidence has been thought to point to very different conclusions as to date and authorship from those which have been commonly accepted. "The Pentateuch," we are told, "was not written by Moses, but is a composite work, in which are embedded the fragments of many ages, from the traditions of the patriarchs to the Book of the Law, which was not found, but written, in the reign of Josiah. The historical books are in like manner anonymous compilations from many volumes of annals and genealogies. Ecclesiastes was written under the Persian or Alexandrian monarchy, and many of the Psalms belong to the age of the Maccabees. The later chapters of Isaiah were the work of a 'great unknown' in the time of Cyrus, and the earlier contain numerous interpolations of the same date. Other prophets have been edited after the same fashion. The first three Gospels have no title to the names they bear, and are not contemporary records. The fourth is the work of a pseudo-Joannes in the second century."

The Pastoral Epistles as a group, and the Second Epistle of St. Peter, are manifestly spurious. It may be questioned whether the same may not be said of the Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians."

It is interesting to know that, in Dr. Plumptre's opinion, Bishop Lightfoot, Canon Westcott, Archdeacon Watkins, and Canon Sanday have satisfactorily answered these difficulties, though it does not follow that even all the members of the Christian Evidence Society, to whom his words were originally addressed, will be prepared to accept their conclusions on his *ipse dixit*. We agree with him, however, that each objection ought to be examined and decided on its own merits, and that, if it should be proved, *e.g.*, that Deuteronomy was not written by Moses, nor Ecclesiastes by Solomon, all that would necessarily follow would be that personated authorship, apart from the intention to deceive, may be as legitimate within as without the sphere of inspired literature. Whether "it is acknowledged on all hands that"—putting aside records of supernatural events—"the history both of the Old and New Testament stands now on a firmer footing than it did a century ago," may be questioned. No doubt Assyrian, Babylonian, and classical inscriptions have thrown much new light both on Jewish and Christian history. But, on the other hand, modern science and criticism have forged many fresh weapons for the use of the sceptic of which Tom Paine, for instance, with the best possible will to be aggressive, had no inkling at all. It betrays again a happy innocence of popular currents of religious thought to say that "no one now dreams of suggesting"—what was freely proclaimed two or three centuries ago—"that a new translation [of the Bible] must, *ipso facto*, even if a better one, multiply doubts and throw men into a temper of uncertainty." Such doubts may be very unreasonable in themselves, and to allege them as an objection to undertaking the task of revision may be still more so; that is quite another question. But Dr. Plumptre must indeed be living in a fool's paradise, from which a very cursory glance at the religious newspapers of the day might have roused him, if he is unaware that such objections have been loudly urged in many quarters—from Convocation downwards—before the work was begun, and still more since the completion of the most critical portion of it, with its manifold omissions, displacements, and reconstructions of familiar texts. We do not say that such difficulties trouble the serene composure of those learned circles and leading minds with whom Dr. Plumptre affects to be so exclusively conversant that, as we gather from a note, he had written his paper before he became dimly conscious of the existence of a profane vulgar whether of believers or unbelievers. Yet he might have remembered that a conspicuous and influential, if not very discreet, leader in the religious world publicly prayed not very long ago—in reference, if our memory serves us, to this very matter of Biblical revision—to be "delivered from the tyranny of professors."

It is, however, in the last section of his inquiry, where he comes to deal with ethical objections to revealed truth, that Dr. Plumptre's self-complacent optimism reveals itself with the most perplexing naïveté. Here "the Apologist" breaks into an almost unbroken song of triumph.

The thoughts that widen with the years, the "survival of the fittest" in the history of dogma, the true development of Christian theology, have removed some of the dark imaginations which once clouded men's vision and views of the Truth of which they undertook to be the defenders. *The dark shadow of Augustine and of Calvin no longer rests on our conceptions of the Fatherhood of God. The name of Athanasius is no longer identified with the Damnable Clauses. The dogma that all unbaptized children are excluded from the eternal hope, which made Augustine known as the "durus pater infantum," and which our own Prayer Book but narrowly escaped, has been banished to the limbo of extinct beliefs.*

We have ventured to italicize some of the more questionable periods of this lyrical epicinon which seem to share the obscurity as well as the grandeur of a Greek chorus. Is the "dark shadow of Augustine and Calvin" the poetical synonym for the doctrine of predestination or of eternal punishment—both of which are not uncommonly identified with their names—or for what else? In either case the jubilation is a little premature. One of the first English divines of the day—the late Dr. Mozley—wrote an elaborate treatise in defence of the Augustinian theory of predestination, which is still widely held; and Dr. Plumptre can hardly be ignorant that the doctrine of eternal punishment, in spite of the efforts of himself and some of his friends to dislodge it, still retains its place in the creed of the immense majority of Christians. As to the name of Athanasius being no longer connected with the damnable clauses, it is still less clear what is meant. The clauses in question are just as much of course a part of the Creed as they ever were, and it is no modern discovery that the Creed was not actually composed by the father whose name it bears, while recent researches have rather served to establish than to shake its early origin. If Dr. Plumptre means that the Creed, or some particular clauses of it, do not fairly represent the mind of Athanasius, that is a point on which he will certainly find a great many divines fully his equals in learning to differ from him. And as to unbaptized children being "excluded from the eternal hope"—an enigmatic phrase which he has borrowed without explaining it from Dr. Farrar—here, too, there is much room for explanation. If he refers to the tenet that unchristened infants do not enter heaven, that certainly is not "banished to the limbo of extinct beliefs," for it is the received teaching of the Roman Catholic Church, and is, as he himself admits, implied or all but implied in the language of the English Prayer Book. If on the other hand he is thinking of the *horrible decretum* by which Calvin assigned them to eternal

fire, his language is singularly ill-chosen, and the notion in question has long since been abandoned at least by all theologians. We are told further down on the same page that "we no longer consider ourselves bound to hold a brief, defending the character of lawgiver, patriarch, king, or prophet, as free from infirmities or sins." Considering that grave infirmities or sins of all these personages—notably the sin and repentance of David—are expressly recorded in the Old Testament, it is not easy to see how any one anxious to maintain its divine inspiration should have ever felt bound, or authorized, "to hold a brief" for a view which directly contradicts its testimony. On the other hand, if Dr. Plumptre thinks that now, any more than before, it is open to any consistent apologist of Biblical inspiration to decline to vindicate, as a whole, the character of "the man after God's own heart"—who is also represented as a special type of Christ—and of other Old Testament heroes, from the fierce assaults which sceptical writers are sometimes fond of making upon them, he appears to us to be much mistaken.

But the last, as it is the most vital, so is it also the most vulnerable, point in this optimistic review of the conflict between faith and unbelief. It may be true in the main that "there is an ever-increasing *consensus*," even among sceptics, as to "the loftiness of Christian ethics and . . . the unapproachable ideal presented by the life of Christ Himself"; though even this would not be granted without very large qualifications by the Positivists, or by such writers as Professor F. Newman; still less, of course, would those who sympathize with the views of "the junior member for Northampton"—and we are afraid they are more numerous than Dr. Plumptre seems willing to admit—"consent" to anything of the kind. But that is not the point we were going to insist upon. If he means to imply that this acceptance, *valeat quantum*, of what Strauss called "the moral contents of Christianity" is any sort of guarantee for the acceptance, or even favourable consideration, of Christian doctrines, we can only say that the "combatants" to whom he refers, by whatever name they may be designated, would one and all repudiate such an inference. The very essence of their contention is that the ethical may be, and ought to be, disjoined from the doctrinal contents of the Gospel, and for this reason Strauss, in his latest work, which leaves nothing to be desired on the score of frankness, started with the fundamental question, "Are we Christians?" and answered it in the negative. And if it be replied that the acceptance of this high ideal by leading Agnostics of the day at least appears good security for the permanent recognition of the Christian standard of ethics among their followers, that also is a most unwarranted assumption. In the first place, the leaders of every party are, as a rule, men of higher than average character and principle, which does not suggest even the faintest presumption that in this respect the bulk of their disciples will emulate their example. And in the next place, it must not be forgotten that nearly all the leading Agnostics of the day have been brought up in Christian belief, and although they may have since been led by scientific or other difficulties to renounce their early creed, they could not, even if they would, at once cast off with it all their ethical antecedents; men do not so easily creep out of their own skins. But supposing Agnostic principles to become more widespread and dominant, when a new generation had grown up who never knew anything of the Gospel, or knew only to reject it, the old conditions would be reversed. And there is no ground in experience for anticipating, what Christians, as such, would have less than no reason for assuming, that Evangelical ethics would survive the abandonment of Evangelical faith. One notable exception—and almost the only one—to what was said just now of the Christian antecedents of our leading Agnostics will occur at once to everybody. Mr. J. S. Mill, who displayed many indications of a noble and even Christian character, was studiously trained by his father in the principles of dogmatic atheism; but here again the exception seems to illustrate the rule. Not to dwell on the fact that Mr. Mill senior had himself received a very definitely Christian education, the moral influence of which he could not fail more or less to transmit to his son, and that J. S. Mill himself, though taught atheism from the cradle, was inevitably born and bred in the atmosphere of a Christian country, it is very remarkable that, just in proportion as his character developed, he appears to have gradually and instinctively recoiled from the negative teaching of his youth, and in his posthumous works has left on record his conviction that, in some sense, theism, and even revelation must be considered at least credible. We cannot recognize then in the teaching or example of the leading champions of unbelief any basis for even the faintest presumption that Christian ethics would continue to prevail in a society where Christian faith was defunct. In the closing words of his article, which are the least optimistic, Dr. Plumptre appears to us to touch most directly on the practical bearings of the question, when he insists that "the true difficulties of faith, the most formidable weapons in the artillery of unbelief, are found in the unreality of our lives, the bitterness and triviality of our controversies," and that there would be better hope of success "if to the force of individual example we could add that of example corporate and combined, as seen in an united Church, a re-united Christendom."

## STEAM-YACHT MATCHES.

**I**N a former article on steam-yacht racing we spoke of the rules by which Mr. Dixon Kemp proposes to regulate the time allowance for racing steamers, and stated that we should return to the subject. We now do so in order to discuss more fully Mr. Kemp's proposals and to see how far they meet the difficulties of the case.

Mr. Kemp's main proposal is, in fact, a formula by which he believes that yachts of very various sizes and powers may be fairly handicapped. His formula deduces from the displacement and horse-power of a steamer a normal or hypothetical speed. The time which one yacht is to allow another in any race is the difference of the times which would be occupied in steaming over the given course, supposing each vessel to steam at her hypothetical speed. Mr. Kemp also gives subsidiary rules by which the displacement and horse-power of given steamer are to be estimated for the purpose of calculating the hypothetical speed.

The rule for calculating displacement was quoted in our former article, and we have nothing to add to the remarks there made upon it. The rule for estimating horse-power requires some further consideration. The proposal is to take two separate and independent methods of obtaining an approximate value for the horse-power from measurements which may be easily made, and to take the mean of the two results which are thus obtained for what we may call the registered horse-power of the engines—i.e. the number which is to be assumed to be the indicated horse-power for the purpose of calculating the time allowance. The first of these methods assumes the horse-power to be proportional to the sum of the areas of the pistons. This is equivalent to the assumption that the mean pressure of steam and the mean velocity of the pistons are the same in all the engines that are compared. The second method takes the horse-power as proportional to the area of fire-grate. This assumes that the quantity of coal burnt per hour is proportional to the area of the fire-grate, and that all the coal burnt is burnt to equally good purpose. It may be that either of these methods, when applied to a good modern marine engine of ordinary construction, will give a fairly good rough approximation to the indicated horse-power; and it seems not improbable that, when there is a considerable difference between the horse-power as given by the two formulae, the mean of the two results will usually give a better value than either of them separately; since, if the fire-grate area is unusually large compared with the area of the pistons, it is likely that, on the one hand, the fire-grate will not consume to good purpose its normal quantity of coal, and, on the other, that the steam pressure and the velocity of the piston will be above the average.

Still, even when applied to engines of ordinary construction, the results are only rather rough approximations. Mr. Kemp gives a table of the horse-power of thirteen men-of-war of different sizes as calculated by his rule and as actually measured. It appears from this table that the errors of calculation are respectively 32, 24, 10, 7, 6, 5, 3, 1.5 per cent. in excess, and 12, 6, 6, 1, 4 per cent. in defect, and it so happens that the largest errors are in the engines of from 100 to 500 horse-power. Now, considering that a difference of 32 per cent. in the horse-power implies, according to Mr. Kemp's rule, a difference of about 10 per cent., and a difference of 12 per cent. a difference of nearly 4 per cent., in the hypothetical speed, it will be seen that the rule is hardly calculated to give universal satisfaction. It must be remembered, too, that the case will become much worse if yachts are specially built to race under such a rule. It will probably not be difficult to design engines in which the steam pressure and velocity of the pistons are much above the average, and in which, by means of a steam blast or otherwise, the quantity of coal burnt on a given area of fire-grate may be considerably increased. These engines would most likely be very bad—i.e. extravagant—ones; but the racing owner will care very little how much coal he burns if he can only get his engines rated for racing purposes at half their real power.

It is much easier, however, to show that Mr. Kemp's rule for estimating engine-power is defective than to suggest a better one. The only satisfactory measure is the indicated horse-power; but how is this to be determined? Is it to be the power developed during a race? This would probably involve the presence on board each racing yacht of an inspecting engineer, which would, we should think, be thought intolerable, and the rule would also deprive the yachtsman of any advantage to be gained by the judicious management of his engines. Or are we to take the power as indicated once for all on trial trips? This would perhaps be the least bad arrangement; but rival owners would probably be unwilling to accept the results of a trial made under the sole management of the owner or builder, whose interest it would be for racing purposes to get his engines rated as low as possible; yet it is more than doubtful whether builders or owners would be willing to hand over their yachts to be tested by a rival firm of engineers, and awkward questions of responsibility would arise in the not improbable event of boilers or engines being injured while under trial. Moreover, such a rule would put a premium on the construction of engines with strange devices which could not be properly worked by one who was not familiar with them; and this again, besides giving an advantage to badly planned engines, would add very appreciably to the risk of a catastrophe on the trial trip, while the attempt was being made to make the monster do its best in strange hands.

But suppose, for the sake of argument, that these difficulties are got over, will Mr. Kemp's fundamental rule enable yachts of different powers to race on equal terms?

Mr. Kemp gets the hypothetical speed by taking the quotient of the registered horse-power by the two-thirds power of the displacement tonnage, multiplying this by a constant, and taking the cube root of the result. The most important assumption here is that the total resistance to motion varies as the square of the velocity, and consequently that the work done in propulsion per unit of time varies as the cube of the velocity. It seems, however, to be more than doubtful whether this holds for ordinary full-powered steam yachts. It is well known that for any vessel there is a certain speed which cannot be exceeded without producing an increase of resistance altogether disproportionate to that which is required to produce a corresponding increase of speed when the vessel is steaming slowly. This maximum speed is that at which the portion of the resistance due to wave-making increases rapidly, and seems to depend mainly upon the length of the entrance and run. For a vessel of given length at the water-line this maximum speed will be greatest for vessels in which the whole length is distributed between entrance and run, so as to leave no middle body of uniform cross-section. For such vessels an approximate rule for determining in knots their maximum speed is to multiply the square root of the length by 10.3. We thus find that the maximum speed for vessels of 150, 100, and 75 feet long on the load water-line would be respectively 12.6, 10.3, and 8.95 knots; and any yacht whose engines are powerful enough to give her a hypothetical speed exceeding the maximum corresponding to her length will necessarily meet with this additional resistance, so that her actual speed will fall short of her hypothetical speed, and she would be hopelessly beaten in a race under Mr. Kemp's rules. Moreover, the best experiments seem to show that at speeds very considerably short of this theoretical maximum the wave-making resistance becomes a very important part of the whole, and the resistance increases with the speed decidedly faster than the square of the velocity. It is probable, then, that in smooth and still water the yachts which would win by time allowance would be very slow indeed. No doubt, on tide-way the case would be different. Suppose the actual speed of two yachts to be the same as their hypothetical speed, and in one case ten knots, in the other eight, these would be equally matched in still water; but the slower yacht would win by 50 minutes over a hundred-mile course with a two-knot tide, and lose by 1 hour 40 minutes over a similar course against the same tide. If the same uniform tide were favourable for fifty miles and unfavourable for the other fifty the slow vessel would lose by 25 minutes. On an average course, wind and tide will probably be unfavourable for more than half the whole time of the race, and consequently the faster yachts would usually gain some advantage from wind and tide, so that the most successful prize winners might not improbably be vessels which nearly attained, but certainly could not be such as exceeded, the maximum speed depending upon the length which has been given above. We suspect that the owners of the smaller classes of steam yachts are not usually content with such speeds as can be economically obtained in a short vessel, but prefer engines which, when doing their best, will drive the hull through the water somewhat faster than it can be driven economically. It would be a paradoxical, but by no means an impossible, result of the adoption of Mr. Kemp's rules that the crack prize winners were yachts too slow for any purpose but racing.

The other assumptions made in Mr. Kemp's formula are that the same proportion of the indicated horse-power is always usefully employed in propelling the ship, and that the resistance is proportionate to the wetted surface of the hull. The first of them gives a perfectly reasonable advantage to improved propellers. The second gives an advantage to large vessels which might be important if yachts of very different sizes competed.

We have before us in the *Field* of March 5, 1881, the particulars of three modern steam yachts of the larger type. It may be interesting to apply Mr. Kemp's formula to them.

If we make use of the actual displacement and the indicated horse-power as observed on the trial trip, we shall get for the hypothetical speeds of the *Fair Geraldine*, *Queen of Palmyra*, and *Marchesa*, 11.2, 11.8, and 9.57 knots respectively; the measured speeds being 11.7, 10.75, and 10.5 respectively. It will be seen that the *Marchesa* wins easily from the *Fair Geraldine*, and the *Queen of Palmyra* is nowhere. If, however, we use Mr. Kemp's rule for estimating horse-power, the case is very different. The cylinder rule gives for the *Fair Geraldine* 405, and the fire-grate rule 660, the mean of these, or horse-power by Mr. Kemp's rule, is 532.5, as against 300 actually indicated. The fire-grate areas of the *Queen of Palmyra* and the *Marchesa* are not given in the *Field*, but the cylinder rule gives 208 and 444.25 respectively, as against 272 and 245 indicated. It is, however, said that the *Marchesa*'s engines could easily work up to 300.

Taking 522.5, 208, and 444.25 as the horse-power for the purpose of calculation, the hypothetical speeds of the three yachts are 13.9, 10.8, and 11.7. With time allowance calculated on these speeds, the *Marchesa* still beats the *Fair Geraldine*; but the *Queen of Palmyra* wins the race by almost an hour in 100 miles, instead of losing it by about an hour and a half. These figures appear to be fatal, at any rate, to Mr. Kemp's rule for estimating engine-power. They also, as far as they go, confirm the supposition that the rule favours large yachts with small engines and very moderate speeds.

It may be said, Why not give a time allowance for size only, and take no more account of engine-power than we do of spread of sail in a sailing yacht? Some restrictions must be placed upon the engines, or our racing yachts would become exaggerated torpedo boats, carrying nothing but their engines and coal for a match; yet it is not easy to see what these restrictions are to be. Limiting the space occupied by the machinery would lead to engine-rooms inconveniently if not dangerously crowded. A penalty on burning more than a certain quantity of coal per hour in proportion to the size of the vessel would probably be the best method if it was practicable to obtain a return of the consumption of coal which was above suspicion—but the "if" is an all-important one.

On the whole, it is pretty clear that while no information could be obtained from a race under steam which could not be got just as well from a well-planned trial trip, yachts built for racing under any possible sailing rules would probably differ essentially in some direction or other from those built for any useful purpose, and the chance of any real improvements in the construction either of hulls or of engines arising out of experiments in steam yacht racing is remote indeed.

Fortunately there is little chance of much money or ingenuity being wasted in this direction. In a race under steam there can be nothing of the infinite variety and sustained interest of a good sailing match. When once the course is settled—and it will seldom differ much from a straight line between the marks—there is nothing to be done but to keep up the greatest possible head of steam by some refinement upon the old Mississippi device of sitting upon the safety-valve and throwing the cargo of "hog-products" into the furnaces. Fashion can do much, but it will hardly succeed in keeping up a permanent interest in races the result of which will ninety-nine times out of a hundred be a foregone conclusion, and which, in the exceptional cases in which there is a real race, will be lost or won in the stoke-hole.

#### GEORGE BORROW.

FEW men without having made a great reputation have exercised a more remarkable influence upon their contemporaries than George Borrow, whose death is just recorded at the age of seventy-eight. He was the son of an officer in the army, and began life as articled clerk to a solicitor in Norwich; but the law had little attractions for him, and his time was chiefly spent in frequenting the society of the gipsy wanderers who are still to be found in large numbers in the eastern counties. The contemplation of their wild life stimulated that propensity for roving and adventure which he displayed at an early age, and which subsequently led him into such a chequered and eventful career. In 1833 he embraced the opportunities for travel which the British and Foreign Bible Society offered to its agents abroad, and went to St. Petersburg in that capacity. Having a wonderful aptitude for acquiring languages, and an especial liking for the less known dialects, he was able while in Russia to edit the New Testament in Mantchu. He next removed to Spain, where the Zincali or gipsies of that country attracted his attention; and, finding that great affinities existed between their *patois* and that of his Norfolk friends, he applied himself earnestly to the study of the dialect, collecting a large vocabulary of their words and a number of their popular songs and legends, as well as translating the Gospel of St. Luke into the dialect. Spain is not a pleasant working ground for a Protestant missionary or distributor of the Scriptures, and Borrow constantly found himself exposed to inconvenience, and even at times to imminent personal danger. He was twice put under arrest, and on one occasion was obliged to seek shelter in the woods in disguise from the fury of the fanatical populace. Returning to England, he published an account of his work and adventures under the title of *The Bible in Spain*, a book which attracted great attention, especially from the light which it threw upon the language and life of an interesting and hitherto almost unknown race. His next journey was to the South of Europe, where he devoted himself almost exclusively to the investigation of gipsy dialects and manners. On his return he published a book called *Lavengro*, "the Professor," a romance for the incidents of which he has drawn largely upon his own personal adventures, especially among the Rommany chals, or "gipsy lads," in whom he took so deep an interest. In this book Borrow unconsciously paints himself in colours which are absolutely true to nature; and, if he appears somewhat pedantic and vain, his manly qualities, his enthusiasm and intrepid courage, more than make up for these failings. *Lavengro* is eminently a romance of the roads—not of ordinary travel, or of coaching, or of railways, as the expression might imply, but of "the roads" in the technical sense given to them by the English "traveller," or tramp, and describing the strange life of the folk who live, not beyond, but outside of the pale of conventional society.

Until Borrow wrote, the gipsies, in England at least, were comparatively unknown. Their language was supposed to be mere cant or thieves' slang, and the constitution of their society was believed to be akin to, if not a survival of, the begging and thieving fraternities and "Alsatian" kingdoms, with which the older novelists have familiarised us, and which M. Victor Hugo has so picturesquely rehabilitated. Bamfyde Moore Carew, the gentleman vagabond, who dubbed himself "king of the gipsies," was long

looked upon as the model of a gipsy hero, and the doings of his "tramps," "mumpers," "thieves," "beggars," and "Abraham's men," were regarded as accurate accounts of gipsy habits. George Borrow's books at once dispelled all these false ideas; the gipsies as he painted them were perhaps hardly more respectable, when judged from the ordinary standpoint, than those of the popular conception, but they were shown to be a national community with a real language, and not a mere motley horde of vagabonds, speaking the jargon of the prisons and the low haunts of towns.

The later researches of Potts, Miclosich, and others leave no doubt as to the Indian origin of the gipsies, although the exact tribe from which they sprung has not been as yet definitely ascertained. Many of the individual words, such as *pāni*, water, are identical in Gipsy and Hindustani; but the grammar of the first-mentioned language, as shown in the mutilated form which remains in English Rommany and the more perfect system of the Turkish Tchingians, is quite different from most of the modern vernaculars of India, and has but few points of contact with the older dialects. There are in India several tribes whose characteristic habits are very similar to those of the gipsies of England. The Jats, Nathas, and Brinjaris, for example, singularly resemble them; and a very good case has been made out in favour of the first-mentioned as the original gipsy stem. It is an historical fact that somewhere about the year 420 A.D. a number of strolling minstrels did find their way into Persia; they were called *Lūri*, and are described by Firdousi in terms which might equally well apply to a band of English Romanies. The word "Lūri" is still used in Persia for strolling minstrels and vagabonds; while, under the form *Nūri*, it is the generic appellation of gipsies in Syria and Egypt. Arab historians speak of these people under the alternative name of *Zutt*, which is, with much reason, believed to be a corruption of *Jāt*. The gipsies call themselves everywhere "Rom" or "Romany," which would point to the "Dom" or "Rom" tribe as their original stock, the initial letter of the word being equivalent to either *D* or *R*. These people, who are principally found in Behar, are essentially a roving tribe. Amongst other things which distinguish them from other Hindoo castes is their indifference to ceremonial impurity, such as that which arises from touching a dead body, and their liking for swine-flesh. Now gipsies in Europe are very peculiar in their eating, and are, perhaps, the only race who will eat animals that have died a natural death. *Mullo baulo*, or "dead pig," is their favourite delicacy; and one of the most typical and amusing of the Rommany ballads which Borrow has collected celebrates the trick formerly so common amongst them of poisoning a pig in order the next day to beg its carcass for food.

Borrow himself, though a skilful linguist, was no philologist, and though his conclusions with regard to the origin of the gipsy language and race are vastly in advance of his predecessors, they are antiquated and erroneous when compared with the researches of later scholars. Thus in his latest work, *Romano Lavo-Lil*, "Word-book of the Rommany," he gives among some correct etymologies others which are simply ridiculous; his collection of gipsy words, too, having been made years ago, cannot compare with the more recent ones of Messrs. Leland, Bath Smart, and others. Still it must be remembered that Borrow was the pioneer of English gipsy lore, and that of all the "Rommany Ryes" who have frequented the tents of the "Caulo chals," and picked up scraps of that "wisdom of the Egyptians" of which they make such a mystery and parade, there is scarcely one but owes his first introduction to a gipsy tutor to the few words of Rommany which he learnt from Borrow's books. It was not that accurate information about gipsies was altogether wanting, for some few Continental scholars had already worked in the field with good results, but the knowledge of the subject was still in an unsatisfactory state; and in this country absolutely nothing had been done. The works of Crabb and others were written by persons who had never gained the sympathy of the people of whom they treated, and who could, therefore, never really understand them; Borrow, on the other hand, had shared their wandering life, and wrote about them as they lived, moved, and spoke. Of late years gipsy literature has assumed formidable proportions. In 1844, three years after the appearance of Borrow's *Zincali*, or *Gypsies of Spain*, Dr. A. F. Pott, of Halle, issued a work entitled *Die Zigeuner in Europa und Asien*, which is a marvel of erudition and research. Later on Professor Miclosich, of Vienna, published in parts an exhaustive treatise, *Ueber die Mundarten und die Wanderungen der zigeuner Europas*; and in 1870 Dr. Paspati published in French at Constantinople a magnificent monogram on the language and literature of the Turkish gipsies with the title, *Etudes sur les Tchingianés*. The Rommany language is spoken with the greatest purity by the gipsies of the Ottoman Empire, and, as Dr. Paspati's work exhibits the language in its perfect grammatical form, it is, as it were, the touchstone for testing the other dialects. M. Paul Bataillard has also made a valuable contribution towards the ethnology and history of the Rommany race in his *L'apparition des Bohémiens en Europe* (1844). Of those who have followed Borrow in his investigations of the English gipsy dialect and traditions, the most noteworthy are Mr. Charles G. Leland (Hans Breitmann) and Dr. Bath Smart. *The English Gipsies and their Language*, by the former, is full of information and abounds in humour; while Dr. Smart's *Dialect of the English Gipsies* is a painstaking and most useful manual of the language. A deep insight into gipsy habits and modes of thought, combined with some amusement, may also be obtained from a volume of ballads in Rommany

and English, compiled jointly by Mr. Leland, Professor E. H. Palmer, and Miss Janet Tuckey.

It is perhaps no very great thing to have given the world a clearer idea of what the gipsy race really is; still, everything which tends to remove error is valuable, and we cannot say how useful the study of the most insignificant race may not prove to the cause of philology and ethnology, both of which sciences are, after all, the handmaids of progress and civilization. To Borrow, however, certainly belongs the honour of having first inspired an intelligent interest and incited to scientific research into the facts connected with the gipsy race at large. But his greatest claim upon the sympathy of the English reader is his translation into action and his autobiographical expression of that spirit of adventure and that restless desire for travel and new experience which is the chief characteristic of English youth. The feeling is a healthy one, and if now and then some stirring book of naval adventure sends one boy to sea, or a perusal of Borrow's works drives another to seek the disreputable but instructive society of gipsy vagabonds, no such great harm, after all, is done. At any rate, the career and works of George Borrow are well worthy of study; he may have been "vagabond" by taste and habit, but he was eminently a Christian and a gentleman, and many men have earned greater name and fame without half his claims to the gratitude of society.

#### THE ABOLITION OF FOG.

THE meeting convened lately by the Smoke Abatement Committee shows that one of the worst nuisances of London life, the blighting and suffocating fog, is now exciting serious attention. Although the fogs of last year were less memorable both in intensity and duration than those of the preceding year, the Society which has undertaken the task of grappling with the evil has not relaxed its efforts. Other and more pressing ills, as frozen water-pipes and snow-invaded dwellings, have not been allowed to hide from view the recurring evil of our grimy and deleterious fogs. The meeting, which was ably supported by men of social and scientific eminence, gave expression to the conviction that the smoky atmosphere in which Londoners pass a good part of their lives is a fertile source of injury to our organisms as well as to our possessions. It disfigures our buildings and stunts our vegetation; and in this way, as well as by excluding the bright rays of the sun for a good part of the year, it gives to our city its unenviable distinction of being the most dismal and hideous of European capitals. It not only disfigures—it destroys. It eats into our textile fabrics, and slowly wears away the masonry of our buildings. Worse than all, it impedes the functions of the organism. An atmosphere charged with particles of unconsumed carbon and sulphur would not seem to be well adapted for the human lungs, and scientific investigation bears out the natural conjecture. The careful analysis of London smoke recently made by a scientific physician enables us to see the real nature of the mixture that we are inhaling, and physiological observation has fully confirmed the theory that the surface of the lungs may become coated with an incrustation deposited by the smoky vapour which is inhaled.

It is easy to treat such a meeting as that held at Grosvenor Place with a measure of ridicule, on the ground that it merely enounces a number of general propositions which no sane person would think of challenging. It seems to us, however, that such a feeling is here out of place. If people were all finely organized and practised in close observation there would be but little need to insist on the magnitude of the smoke nuisance. But this is far from being the case. The effects of causes which are in pretty constant operation are only too easily overlooked. And, as for the disfigurement of our surroundings occasioned by smoke, the familiar truth that what is habitually present to our organs of perception escapes attention here receives a striking illustration. It is not only the coarse, uncultivated mind which overlooks the manifold unlovelinesses of our smoke-covered city. Even a lover of the beautiful may cease in time to note the far-reaching aesthetic consequences of a smoky atmosphere out of which he rarely passes. With respect to the hygienic side of the subject, the same thing holds true. The average citizen, blessed with a vigorous organism, is little likely to trouble himself about the unhealthy character of his atmosphere. A constant stimulus acting on any part of the organism fails to excite a conscious sensation. And the trachea and lungs which are habitually bathed by the murky waves of London fog cease in time to be tormented by them. It may be demonstrable from physiological principles that even a robust organism must be less healthy in such impure surroundings, yet the loss in vital energy is easily overlooked when unaccompanied by positive sensations of discomfort. Now and again, perhaps, when the smoky mixture dignified by the name of air is unusually dense, as in the memorable winter already referred to, even such a hardy person becomes momentarily aware of the deleterious properties of fog; but when the slight feeling of irritation is past, he settles down to his customary proportion of impurities as to something perfectly natural and harmless. Even where these impurities tell upon the health of some more delicately organised member of his family he is very likely to misapprehend the real cause of the evil. In order to refer things to their causes we must be able to compare circumstances in which they are present with those in which they are absent; and the ordinary Londoner who

seldom goes out of town plainly wants the data for reasoning about the subject. It would seem to follow, then, that much remains to be done in arousing the public mind to a sense of the gravity of the evil of living in a smoke-weighted atmosphere.

There seems little good in calling attention to evils which we are unable to set right. It is natural for the mind that is only partially impressed with the hurtfulness of smoke to lapse into the comfortable belief that the evil is in its nature incurable. When we discover that we have all our lives been incurring risks of which we have been totally ignorant, we are at first disposed to acquiesce in the state of things as normal and necessary. A very little reflection, however, will suffice to suggest that as our smoky habitat is an artificial creation of our own, its permanence is a matter which lies with ourselves. In other words, we are led to reflect that this is not a case in which the organism has to adapt itself to a fixed environment, but one in which it is called on to modify its environment. The Smoke Abatement Committee show plainly enough that they take this view of the matter, and that they are bent on supplying a remedy for the evils which they seek to expose. Already, as a consequence of the growing interest in the subject, a considerable amount of ingenuity has been devoted to the practical solution of the question. For some time past we have heard of a number of inventions by which the effects of our smoke-emitting grates may be avoided. The Committee has wisely arranged for an exhibition of the various improved heating and smoke-preventing appliances which have been proposed of late. This exhibition, which will illustrate the proposed substitutes for our smoky grates in actual operation, may be expected to have a double effect. In the first place, people who are indifferent to the evil of smoke can hardly fail to be impressed with its existence and its gravity when they see how much thought and skill have been directed to its removal. And, secondly, if the exhibition is at all a success, it will teach Londoners that the evil is not one which ought to be quietly submitted to as a part of the permanent order of things, but one which lies altogether within our control. The evidence given by Sir Henry Thompson and others at the meeting referred to enables us to anticipate the result of the exhibition so far as to affirm that our houses may be heated, and adequately heated, by a process that is in the fullest sense smoke-preventing. In the face of such a body of authoritative opinion on this point, nobody is likely henceforth to contest the assertion that the smoke nuisance is one which we have the power of removing if we care to do so.

But though it is allowed that Londoners have the power of ridding themselves of their incubus of smoke it may be doubted whether they will care to do so. The cloud of carbonaceous and sulphurous particles which each morning forms itself anew out of the discharges from our forest of chimneys is closely connected with our chosen way of heating our dwellings. In France or in Germany, where the use of stoves obviates the need of constant fires, and where wood is often substituted for coals, our darkening smoke-mists are unknown. We avowedly prefer our open grates, with their cheerful aspect, their socializing influence, their many venerable associations. We know very well that these firesides are costly luxuries, that a considerable fraction of the fuel for which we pay renders us no service whatever. And it may be thought that even when people have come to understand that their habits involve a good deal of injury to health, they will still persist in them. That is to say, they may deliberately prefer the advantages of the blazing hearth to those which would be secured by a smokeless mode of heating; or at least it may be supposed that the force of custom would turn the balance in favour of remaining as we are. In support of this view it has been alleged that the present agitation about smoke is by no means new; that as early as the close of the last century attempts were made to introduce a cleanly and healthy substitute for our open grates; and that since that time the subject has again and again come up for discussion, and then been allowed to drop out of sight.

This pessimistic view of the present attempt to carry a pressing sanitary reform is no doubt a plausible one. We are quite aware that Englishmen are often foolishly conservative, tenaciously clinging to their peculiar habits when they are at least dimly aware of their undesirability. Yet even Englishmen are ready to adopt a new fashion when they are thoroughly convinced of its superiority to the old one. When Londoners are fully alive to all the mischiefs wrought by their dirty atmosphere, they will not, one supposes, long hesitate to accept a more wholesome style of heating their houses. To imagine that they would knowingly set up the sentimental considerations already touched on, in opposition to the substantial arguments of the man of science and the physician, seems to us to misunderstand the English mind. Compared with other nations we are but slightly governed by sentiment, and even the deeply-rooted feeling for the cheerful English fire would probably give way to a clear conviction that its indulgence involves injury to health. And this result will certainly be hastened by the fact that the proposed substitutes for our present thriftless grates are likely to be much more effective and much less costly. It is a part of the irony of the existing state of things that, with all the greater appearance of heat which we gain at the expense of our lungs, we are in reality much worse off than those who use the closed stove. The peculiarity of our English fireplace is that it heats one small portion of a room on the condition of making the other parts chill and draughty. And to this it may be added that we secure this curious result at a much greater pecuniary cost than is incurred by our neighbours. Should all this be fully understood and realized by the majority

of Londoners, they would, we are convinced, soon consent to give up their cherished firesides.

It thus seems that the prospect of removing, or at least greatly reducing, the smoke nuisance really depends on the waking up of the public mind to the existence of the evil. That this will happen immediately we are not sanguine enough to anticipate. The growth of an adequate sense of the loss and positive harm occasioned by the artificial atmosphere with which we surround ourselves will pretty certainly be a slow process. The Society which aims at enlightening the public mind on the subject will accordingly have to harp on the various ill consequences of smoke for a long time to come. Only after frequent reiteration are the salutary lessons which science has to teach fully seized and assimilated by the popular intelligence. At the same time, it is probable that there are forces working in the direction of the Society's efforts. The increase of general information must, one conceives, have the effect of bringing home to Londoners to some extent the pestilential character of their smoke-laden atmosphere. Thus, for example, the publication of the varying death-rate in the metropolis is well calculated to call men's minds to the consideration of the disagreeable subject. It is probable that a good part of the present lively interest in the matter is due to the profound impression made by the announcement that an exceptionally severe form of fog which occurred the winter before last raised the proportion of deaths in the metropolis by a very appreciable interval. In addition to this, all the knowledge which goes to the comparative study of life is contributing to the same result. The more generally Englishmen travel and contrast the surroundings of life abroad with those at home the more likely are they to become alive to the drawbacks of the latter. And even that large body of Londoners which does not go abroad is acquiring, through improved facilities in locomotion, the means of judging the true character of their daily environment. Perhaps nothing will more materially contribute to the growth of a powerful antipathy to London smoke than the rapidly spreading habit of living outside London. A man who, on an average winter morning, enters the City from a point twenty miles distant cannot fail to be struck by the contrast. His breathing organs will be irritated by the impurities to which they have not accustomed themselves; his eye will miss the gladdening rays of the sun and note the depressing hue which the dingy vapours cast on every object. The more frequently the Londoner emerges from his murky mists the less indifferent is he likely to become to their existence. The present agitation of the subject is thus likely to be supported by the action of natural causes. And this fact should encourage the friends of the movement in the face of what are undoubtedly many and serious obstacles.

#### MR. GLADSTONE'S NEW PLAN FOR THE REDEMPTION OF DEBT.

**I**N preparation for the discussion of his Bill for the redemption of 60 millions of Consols Mr. Gladstone issued last week a Treasury Minute, which very clearly explains the means by which he is to effect his object. There are at present existing Terminable Annuities to the amount of 7,107,571*l.*, of which, in round numbers, about 6 millions will expire in 1885. They were created to pay off debts incurred in various ways; for fortifications, local barracks, through recent war deficiencies, and they were created also for the extinction of funded debt. Apparently Mr. Gladstone is anxious that the whole amount should continue to be applied to the redemption of debt. It is impossible, of course, to foresee who may be Chancellor of the Exchequer four years hence; but, whoever he may be, he will have a strong temptation to purchase a little temporary popularity by remitting taxation instead of continuing to apply the annuities to the payment of the debt. If he should be a weak man, or if his Government should be in need of popular support, he may yield to the temptation, and Mr. Gladstone has taken a step which will take out of his power two millions of these annuities. As is well known, the public will not buy Terminable Annuities. A Terminable Annuity, in fact, consists partly of interest and partly of an instalment of principal; and the purchaser of such annuity, if he does not intend to spend his principal, should be careful to reinvest so much of his annuity as is principal, and to spend only the remainder, that is, the interest. But the great majority of people, even business people, are incapable of calculating how much of the annuity is principal and how much interest. Consequently the Government find few purchasers of Terminable Annuities in the open market, and they are obliged, therefore, to limit this method of paying off the debt to the amount which the funds under their own control enable them to deal with. At present it would seem that Mr. Gladstone has not funds that would permit him to deal with more than 2 out of the 6 millions which will expire in 1885. But it is to be hoped that, if he does not remain in office till 1885, before he retires he will in some way make sure that the sum now set apart for the redemption of debt will continue to be appropriated to that purpose.

As we have said, about 6 millions of the existing Terminable Annuities will expire in 1885, and Mr. Gladstone proposes to prolong 2 of these 6 millions till 1906. His object in doing so is to obtain as much free revenue as will enable him to redeem another 60 millions of the debt. It is calculated by the Actuary

of the National Debt Office that, assuming Consols to be at par, 459,760*l.* in twenty-five years will redeem a sum equal to that which would be redeemed in four years by 2 millions. This will set free a revenue of 1,540,240*l.*, by the assistance of which Mr. Gladstone proposes to cancel stock to the amount of 60 millions sterling. When the 60 millions of Consols are cancelled and converted into Terminable Annuities, the interest upon these 60 millions will also be set free, amounting to 1,800,000*l.* In this way Mr. Gladstone obtains a total annual sum of 3,340,240*l.* But it is estimated by the Actuary of the National Debt Office that an annuity of 3,428,604*l.* will pay off 60 millions of Consols in twenty-five years, and as we have just now seen, Mr. Gladstone by prolonging his annuity of 2 millions from four to twenty-five years, and by cancelling 60 millions of Consols, has obtained an annual free revenue of 3,340,240*l.* He needs, therefore, only 88,364*l.* to make up the Terminable Annuity required to pay off in twenty-five years the 60 millions of Consols, and this sum, therefore, is the only addition to be made to the permanent charge of the debt for the extinction in twenty-five years of 60 millions of Consols. In other words, by simply prolonging for one-and-twenty years 2 millions of the Terminable Annuities now existing, and by adding to them somewhat less than 89,000*l.*, Mr. Gladstone is enabled to cancel and pay off 60 millions of the debt. As we have explained above, he is able to do this only because there are held by officers, under the control of the Treasury, Consols to the amount of 60 millions; 20 millions of these are held by the National Debt Commissioners on account of the Savings Banks, and 40 millions are held by the Chancery Paymaster. When 20 millions are taken from the Savings Bank account, the National Debt Commissioners will still hold 11 millions of Consols, besides 7*1*/<sub>2</sub> millions of Exchequer Bonds and various other available securities. They will therefore have ample means to meet any demand that may come upon them in the way of withdrawals of deposits by the Savings Banks. In ordinary years the deposits on account of the Savings Banks exceed the withdrawals, and as we may hope that we are now entering upon a cycle of good years, it is to be expected that the excess will be larger than usual. But, even if this should not prove to be the case, and if the withdrawals should be larger than anticipated, the National Debt Commissioners will still have an ample margin to meet all the calls upon them. Mr. Gladstone devotes a large part of his Minute to prove that the interest of the suitors in Chancery are equally well cared for, and his proof is complete. We need not go into this part of the Minute in detail here. It will be enough to state roughly the principal points. Stock held by the High Court of Chancery has steadily increased in the past. Between October 1, 1847, and August 1879, the stock so held increased from 46,796,000*l.* to 61,886,000*l.*, an increase of over 15 millions, or more than 33 per cent.; and there is every reason to believe that it will go on increasing. In fact, as the wealth of the country grows, it is evident that funds coming under the administration of the Court of Chancery must grow with it. There is every assurance, therefore, that the Court of Chancery will continue to hold a sufficient amount of stock to meet any demand that may be made upon it. But, to make assurance doubly sure, Mr. Gladstone, in concert with the Lord Chancellor, takes elaborate precautions to secure that, if more stock should be needed, it shall be at once forthcoming.

The direct and indirect effects of this conversion of Consols into Terminable Annuities must be very great. In the first place, it is a kind of pledge that the Government will not allow any part of the Terminable Annuities now existing for the extension of debt to lapse or to be applied to other purposes, and, consequently, that the redemption of debt will proceed at a very rapid rate henceforward. In itself alone this must have a great influence on the market. It will tend to give a new impulse to the rise in Consols which has been going on for some years. But, furthermore, the measure will directly increase the purchases of Consols by the Government officers. As we have just been explaining, 60 millions of Consols are to be cancelled at once; but their place must be supplied by the National Debt Commissioners and by the Chancery Paymaster by the re-investment in Consols of each instalment of capital as it is paid. In the new annuity of 3,428,604*l.*, as we have just seen, 1,800,000*l.* in the first year will be interest, and the remainder repayment of principal. After the first year, however, the amount of the interest will go on steadily decreasing, while the amount of the principal will steadily increase, until, as we reach the year 1905, almost the whole of the annuity will be repayment of principal, and the interest will dwindle to a vanishing point. If, at the same time, the remaining 4 millions of Terminable Annuities which are to expire in 1885 are prolonged, the effect will be enormous, and the price of Consols must rise to a point which will admit of the reduction of the interest on the debt to 2*1*/<sub>2</sub> per cent., unless, indeed, a war or some other great calamity should compel the Government to create Consols more rapidly than it buys them up. While these purchases on the part of the National Debt Commissioners and the Chancery Paymaster are going on, the Government itself will also be buying if the trade improvement continues, and we once more have surpluses of revenue over expenditure. The Government purchases, it is true, will be for the Sinking Fund, and the amount so bought will at once be cancelled, whereas the purchases by the National Debt Commissioners and the Chancery Paymaster will be on behalf of the Savings Banks fund and the suitors in Chancery, and will remain intact. But the effect on the open market will be the same in both cases, for the amounts bought by the National

Debt Commissioners and the Chancery Paymaster will not be sold again, except in the rare cases where the withdrawals by the Savings Banks or repayments to the suitors in Chancery necessitate sales. As a rule, however, the purchases made by the National Debt Commissioners and the Chancery Paymaster are real withdrawals of Consols from the open market, and diminish by so much the supply of Consols for the public. While this is going on, the public will also be purchasing. There are large classes, such as trustees, who must invest in Consols. Banks also are bound to hold a certain portion of their reserves in Consols, and so are other great establishments like insurance offices. Their purchases will add to the effect of the purchases by the Government and by the National Debt Commissioners and the Chancery Paymaster, and will tend to raise year by year the price of Consols. As we have already said, the accumulated effect of all these purchases can be neutralized only by a great war, or some other circumstance which would compel the Government to issue large amounts of Consols. The Irish Land Bill, no doubt, will, to some extent, cause a new issue of Consols. If that portion of the Bill which proposes to establish a peasant proprietary in Ireland is largely acted upon, the funds advanced by the Commissioners must be furnished by the issue of Consols, and, therefore, it may be argued that the new supply in the market will go to neutralize the increased purchasing. But it is doubtful whether this will be so. If large numbers of the Irish landlords sell their estates, it is probable that they will prefer to take in payment Consols rather than money. They will not be inclined to re-invest in Irish land, and as the interest returned upon either English or Scotch land will not be greater than the interest yielded by Consols, they will have no inducement to encumber themselves with the management of property when they can have as large an income free from care of every kind by simply continuing to hold Consols. We are inclined to doubt, therefore, whether the Irish Land Bill, however much the clauses establishing a peasant proprietary may be availed of, will increase the supply of Consols in the market. A great war undoubtedly would increase the supply and neutralize the effect of Mr. Gladstone's measures; but anything short of a great war will have little effect. For every year the growth of population and of wealth is increasing the demand for Consols, and the cancellation of 60 millions of Consols at once and their gradual replacement by the accumulation of another 60 millions in the hands of the National Debt Commissioners and the Chancery Paymaster in the course of five-and-twenty years must have an immense effect, without speaking of any of the other influences to which we have been referring above.

## THE THEATRES.

IT is not very long since the old question of indebtedness of English to French playwrights was revived in a somewhat amusing fashion, and the revival led, not unnaturally, to a certain amount of gossip, both particular and general, concerning this old story. Amongst other things, it was at the time stated or hinted that a certain play, which had seemed to all the London critics to give the lie to the assumption that it was impossible for an English play-writer to invent a well-constructed plot, was, in fact, borrowed from a French source. The play was a play by a clever actor and playwright, Mr. Pinero, and the title assigned to the French play from which he was supposed to have borrowed was curiously in harmony with the theory that his English play was not original. Indeed, the title given to the French play appeared at once to explain a certain oddity in that of the English one. The theory was so plausible on the face of it that we thought it worthy of investigation, and the result of careful investigation is that no play bearing the title which was given out is known to those who are best qualified to speak with authority upon the subject in Paris. If any additional proof of Mr. Pinero's capacity to construct such a dove-tailed plot as many Parisian dramatists delight in is needed, it would be found in his play called *Imprudence*, lately produced under Mr. Carton's management at the Folly Theatre. Mr. Pinero has suffered to a certain extent, as all followers of any art do suffer, because he has not chosen to do the same thing over and over again. He wrote an emotional play, which achieved a well-merited success, and he has followed it up with an almost entirely comic play, which, in its line, deserves equal success. He had before this produced one or two little pieces, which were not in their essence pathetic; but it seemed to be expected that, if he ever committed himself to more than one act, he would have to go in for the serious side of life. In other words, his versatility seemed, in the eyes of some critics, a fault rather than a merit. What he has done in the case of *Imprudence* is to produce a piece as neatly and funnily constructed as are the many French plays of the same calibre which have of late years given much gain to translators, and a piece which differs from those just referred to in that it has no offence in it. It has, instead, various touches which remind one of Mr. Pinero's success in another line, and which, according to some critics, seem out of place in a play of which the chief motive is unrestrained comedy. We are not ourselves of opinion that they are at all out of place; on the contrary, the few discreetly introduced touches of real feeling complement admirably, to our thinking, the generally amusing, and it may be said reckless, character of the work. We are introduced to a purely comic state of society, and to characters who for the most part are purely comic; and it has

been contended that they should be throughout purely comic, and nothing else. Mr. Pinero is rightly, as we think, of a different opinion. His play is full of what may be termed farcical incidents, but he has made it more than a farcical comedy by introducing a certain vein of emotion. The emotion is lightly touched by the author, and is given with equally commendable lightness by the players, and it serves, as it seems to us, to maintain on the part of the spectators an interest which might possibly flag without it. Three acts of mere smartness and farce have before now been known to be wearisome. It is surely to the credit of author and actors that *Imprudence* is the reverse of wearisome.

The action of the piece passes in a boarding-house, which has some resemblance to the one depicted in *Sketches by Boz*. It is curious, and it is also a tribute to the playwright's verisimilitude, that the characteristics of boarding-houses have changed comparatively little between the days of "Boz's" sketch and the present time. People who have frequented or visited boarding-houses of this day will see that the atmosphere of *Imprudence* is very far from being exaggerated. While many of Dickens's pictures of manners and customs are antiquated, his earlier and later sketches of boarding-house life are still in the main true to nature. The author of *Imprudence* probably knew that he would be taxed with borrowing from Dickens, and it is his merit that he has not shirked this danger. The events which follow each other in rapid succession in Mrs. Lazenby's boarding-house are improbable enough, and their very improbability is a source of amusement; but the *entourage* which makes such events possible for dramatic purposes is, we take it, as true now as it was many years ago.

To give in any detail the plot of a comedy of intrigue like *Imprudence* would be to spoil the pleasure of spectators. The piece depends mainly upon a skilfully arranged series of bustling situations, relieved, as we have hinted, by a few passages of emotion, to which excellent justice is done by those concerned. The weight of the performance, if we can speak of weight with regard to a thing essentially light, rests upon Mr. Carton, the actor-manager, who, by the finesse and the force of his playing, more than confirms the high opinion which we have ventured to express of his powers on former occasions when they had less scope. He is admirably supported by Miss Compton, by Miss Kate Bishop, and, it may be said in fine, by every one concerned in the representation of a piece the stage-management of which is as good as the acting. Of the general nature of the play we have perhaps said enough. It may be added that the dialogue, for the most part, is as neat and terse as the construction. One or two pleasantries might, however, be cut out with decided advantage.

## MIDSUMMER RACING.

THE first race of importance which followed the Ascot meeting was the Northumberland Plate at Newcastle-upon-Tyne. As the event proved, it was anything but an exciting affair. Mr. Jardine's *Bonnie Doon* was a very strong favourite, and he won in a canter by five lengths. This horse had been a high-priced yearling, but he had not been able to run as a young horse on account of an accident. At the Bibury Club and the Stockbridge meetings Lord Stamford's good two-year-old filly *Geheimniss*, by Rosicrucian, showed fine form. Her winnings by the end of the Stockbridge week exceeded 2,500 guineas, and she had run four times without being beaten. *Charibert*, who has turned out an extraordinary horse over short courses, won the Stockbridge Cup. In the Queen's Plate *Petronel* beat *Exeter*, after a very hard-fought race. *Exeter* was the favourite, and the race was run at a good pace over the long course of two miles. There was a fine race, again, for a Biennial, in which that uncertain horse *Scobell* beat *Thora* by a neck. In the following week came the July Stakes at Newmarket, one of the great two-year-old races of the season. The first favourite won, but only after an exciting race, by half a length. The winner is a brown filly of Lord Rosebery's, named *Kermesse*. She is by *Cremorne* out of *Hazeldean*. *Hazeldean* was by that very game horse *Cathedral*, out of *Nutbush*, who was one of the fastest fillies of her time. Some judges think *Kermesse* a little small, while others consider her large in all those parts of a racehorse where size is most necessary; some point out the excellency of her head, neck, and muscular, well-placed shoulders, the symmetry and power of her back, loins, and quarters, and the perfection of her lengthy, low, galloping action; others contend that her forelegs are too light and straight to endure the wear and tear of training, or even the force of her own great speed in racing. *Marden*, who was second, had run nowhere at Stockbridge to *Geheimniss*, although it is only fair to say that he was then carrying 4 lbs extra weight; and in the July Stakes he beat *St. Marguerite* by half a length, while at Stockbridge he had been some distance behind her. *St. Marguerite* is own sister to *Thebais*, the winner of the Oaks of this year. In the July Stakes she ran a dead heat for third place with *Dutch Oven*, a filly out of the dam of the famous *Bal Gal*. It was rather singular that sisters of the two most celebrated two-year-olds of last year should run a dead heat for a very forward position in the July Stakes of this year. The next day *St. Marguerite* won the valuable Chesterfield Stakes in an easy canter by a length; and a

week later Dutch Oven won the Great Lancashire Yearling Stakes at Manchester, a race worth nearly 1,500*l.* But, to return to the Newmarket July meeting, we may observe that Peter, the hero of the late Ascot meeting, made another exhibition of temper in the July Cup, and would not attempt to race with Charibert, although it may be an open question whether he could have beaten Charibert over six furlongs, even if he had tried.

The prospects of the Goodwood meeting were much clouded by the prevalence of severe influenza and coughs in several large racing stables. It had been hoped that Bend Or and Robert the Devil would have met again, but both horses were attacked by colds. Their owners set admirable examples by scratching their horses as soon as there seemed to be no hopes of their being able to run. It is a pity that this line of conduct is not more often followed by owners of racehorses. On the first day of the Goodwood meeting the principal two-year-olds already mentioned, with the exception of Geheimniss and Marden, met again in the Richmond Stakes. Kermesse was the favourite, and St. Marguerite, Dutch Oven, and Purple and Scarlet were estimated in the order given. There was a grand race; Kermesse in the middle, with Dutch Oven and St. Marguerite on either side, raced from the distance almost abreast, and at last Dutch Oven won by a head, Kermesse and St. Marguerite running a dead heat for second place. Now Archer was riding Dutch Oven, and in our humble opinion this may have been enough to account for the victory by a head. Kermesse was giving each of the other two fillies 4*lb.*, so it is possible that she may still be a trifle the best of the three. Dutch Oven is a fine well-made filly, but there were reports in circulation to the effect that, like her half-sister, Bal Gal, she was a roarer. It is a curious fact that out of the five races for the Richmond Stakes which have taken place since its institution in 1877, four of them have been won by horses (or rather fillies) belonging to Lord Falmouth, and that each of the five winners of the race has been ridden by Archer. The Goodwood Stakes was a disappointing race, as it was won by a lightly-weighted selling-plate called Brown Bess; but there was one unusual feature of the race—namely, that it was run during a terrific storm of lightning, thunder, and rain. Between the brilliant flashes of the lightning and the blinding downpour it was almost impossible to see much of the race. There were several very hardly fought contests during the day, and for five of the races there were good fields. Altogether the opening day of the Goodwood meeting was far better than the racing public had been led to expect.

The Sussex Stakes, on the Wednesday, was won by Limestone, after a fine race with Geologist. Skipetar was third. The stakes were worth 1,517*l.* The winner is a fine horse, about 16 hands high, and he became fourth favourite for the St. Leger after his victory in the Sussex Stakes. Twenty-eight horses ran for the Stewards' Cup, which was won by Mazurka, who had been one of the triple dead-heaters for the Astley Stakes at Lewes last year. She is small but beautifully shaped, and has great strength in her back and loins, while her shoulders are just what they ought to be to produce great speed. The Lavant Stakes ended in a fine race, Archer winning very cleverly by a length on Baliol, a son of Blair Athol's, who was running for the first time. This colt was not by any means universally admired by judges of horseflesh, some considering him too narrow, with but second-rate fore-legs. Sutler, who has won a good many races this season, ran very gamely in the Visitors' Plate; for, after appearing to be beaten, he struggled on, and, wearing down his opponent, won by a head. There was a fine struggle again in the following race, Osborne, or Privateer, getting the best of Archer on Passaic, the first favourite. Archer made one of his scientific rushes, but he was beaten by a head. Out of the seven races that were run on the Wednesday five were well contested, and in most cases there were good fields. The weather was all that could be wished, and everything tended to make the day a pleasant one, but, unfortunately, in the evening there was a fatal accident on the drive home, in which two lives were lost.

On the Thursday there was a fine race for the Corinthian Plate between Sword Dance and Kuhleborn, the former, ridden by Archer, winning by a very short head. The Racing Stakes was the cause of much interest, because Privateer and Passaic, who had run a close race for the last event of the preceding day, were now to meet again under the same jockeys and under similar weights. In spite of his defeat on the previous day, Passaic was again made first favourite, and once more there was a tremendous struggle. The form of the Drawing Room Stakes was, however, exactly confirmed, for Privateer again won by head, although Archer exerted all his skill on Passaic. Peter was a strong favourite for the Goodwood Cup, and it was generally believed that the result depended entirely upon the state of his temper. To people's astonishment, however, all four competitors were restive at the post; indeed, Madame Du Barry and Fernandez behaved even worse than Peter. These four matured racehorses were more unruly before their two-and-a-half mile race than many large fields of two-year-olds before a T.Y.C. scramble; but when once they did get off they went away on very equal terms. All went well until they reached the Craven starting post, where Fernandez began to run unkindly, and refused to try any more. Before they came to the Mile post Peter also grew tired of the performance, and planting his toes firmly into the ground, he indulged in a hearty kick, and then sidded off into the gorse. Madame Du Barry and Nottingham were now the only horses left in the race, and the former had no difficulty in winning by twenty lengths. This was a miserable

result after the early promise of a terrific encounter between Bend Or, Robert the Devil, and Peter. After the Cup came the Rous Memorial Stakes for two-year-olds, a race worth 1,737*l.* Purse-bearer was the first favourite. This appeared reasonable enough, for in the Great Lancashire Yearling Stakes he had run within three-quarters of a length of Dutch Oven, and now he was to meet her on 15*lb.* better terms. When they came to the distance, Dutch Oven was running very kindly, but although Purse-bearer was struggling gamely, he was evidently beaten, and Dutch Oven won by a length, St. Marguerite being two lengths behind Purse-bearer. The day ended by another display of wickedness on the part of Peter, who, after odds had been laid on him for the Singleton Stakes, stopped soon after the start, and deliberately engaged in a kicking bout.

In the opening race of the last day backers were almost clever enough to place the four runners in exactly the reverse order to that in which they came in. Carlyle was the first favourite, at 2 to 1; 5 to 2 was laid against Baliol, 10 to 1 against Forget Me Not, and as much as 20 to 1 against Adrastus. There was a magnificent race; but it was not at all in accordance with the anticipations of the prophets, for Adrastus won by a head from Baliol, who beat Forget Me Not by a head, Carlyle, the first favourite, being absolutely last, half a length off. The Chesterfield Cup was won from a large field by Victor Emmanuel, who won the same race last year. His victory was a surprise, as 16 to 1 had been laid against him at the start. In the last race of the meeting, Thebais, the winner of the One Thousand Guineas and the Oaks, gave Bal Gal 12*lb.*, and beat her by fifteen lengths. Before the Goodwood meeting it was expected that the racing would be very far from first-rate, and that the fields would be small; but, as the event turned out, the meeting was a decided success; there was excellent racing, plenty of horses ran in most of the races, the course was in capital order, and the weather, with the exception of one thunderstorm, was all that could be desired.

## REVIEWS.

### LES QUATRE VENTS DE L'ESPRIT.\*

THERE can be but little hesitation in deciding that, of the various divisions of M. Victor Hugo's latest volumes of poetry, the most important are "Le Livre Dramatique," "Le Livre Lyrique," and "Le Livre Epique." "Le Livre Satirique" is, it seems to us, too coloured by personal impressions, too full of matter which has not in itself, and to which the poet has not imparted, any marked originality, to make it worthy of a place among that great portion of his work which should and will live. It has more or less wild tirades against institutions which M. Victor Hugo has persuaded himself that he disapproves of *en bloc*; it has two impersonal dialogues, which do not show the author at his best; and it has one poem which shows him in his least discreet, considerate, and reticent mood, and the publication of which can hardly but be regretted by such of his admirers as are not fanatical. To say that, in spite of its many shortcomings, it contains fine lines and passages is perhaps unnecessary. But it is certainly not what we should recommend to a friend to whom we wished to prove the greatness of M. Hugo's imagination and power.

"Le Livre Dramatique" has the sub-title of "Les Deux Trouvailles de Gallus," and consists of two dramas which are complementary to each other, and both of which show at their best the poet's grasp of character and power of giving incisive expression to his deep thought. The scene of the first is laid in "Un burg dans une forêt. Intérieur de la grande salle en rez-de-chaussée. Aspect de ruine. Le dénouement rustique mêlé au délabrement seigneurial." The words "En Souabe, 17—" follow the short list of characters, of whom Le Duc Gallus and his chamberlain, Baron Gunich, are the first to appear. They have come on the trail of a beautiful girl named Nella, who lives with her father in this curious *taudis*; and, in the course of the opening conversation between them, we learn that Gallus is a usurper, who has long ago hidden away his nephew, the rightful Duke, in the woods, and who is not now particularly content with the result of his act of usurpation. The throne, he says, is "une triste proie," and continues:—

Sais-tu ce que je suis ? un pauvre homme de joie,  
Plutôt bon que mauvais ; très canaille ; occupé,  
Mais oisif ; fort penaud. Comme on est attrapé !  
L'ambitieux pensif, usurpateur en herbe,  
Dit en prémeditant le trône :—C'est superbe !  
On est le maître ; on a le budget plein les mains ;  
Le prince resplendit, regardé des humains,  
Au-dessus de la terre ; il est dans la comète !  
Vite, ôte-toi de là, petit, que je m'y mette !—  
C'est bon, j'ai pris la place, et je règne. A quel prix !

Les vastes bâflements du céémonial ;  
Beaucoup d'enterrement mêlé d'un peu de bal ;  
Le rang suprême, un mot ; le pouvoir, un problème ;  
Ne jamais être sur qu'une femme vous aime,  
Voilà ce qu'on usurpe, ami.—Si j'avais su !

\* Victor Hugo. *Les Quatre Vents de l'Esprit.* Paris: J. Hetzel.  
A. Quantin.

As the result partly of this particular mood, partly of what a contemporary critic has aptly described as his perverse corruption, Gallus's present design is to find an innocent and charming girl, and watch her progress to evil. The speech in which he avows this intention is charged with the same terse cynicism which is apparent in the curiously accurate description of his own character from which we have just given an extract. It presently appears that Gallus has a rival already, in the person of George, the nephew before referred to, whose only doubt as to the success of his suit arises from his belief that he is of plebeian, while Nella is of patrician, birth. There is a charming love-scene between the two, marred only by one touch of self-conscious prudery on her part which is essentially French; and then Gallus proceeds to pay his court to Nella, and to be repulsed by her with admirable simplicity and wit. Finally, Nella orders him out of the house; and almost at the same moment George and Nella's father, Baron d'Holburg, whom political pressure has reduced to his humble state, appear on the scene. Gallus warns the father of the courtship carried on clandestinely by George, who at last turns on him with a speech ending

Tu te rétracteras syllabe par syllabe !  
Ton nom ?

LE DUC GALLUS.

Je suis Gallus, landgrave de Souabe,  
Le frère du feu duc régnant George premier.  
L'aigle à deux têtes prend son vol sur mon cimier.  
L'Allemagne n'a pas de famille plus grande.

*Il salut profondément le baron.*

Et, monsieur le baron d'Holburg, je vous demande  
En mariage ici votre fille Nella,  
Pour mon neveu le duc George deux.

Montrant George.

Que voilà !

There is one very happy touch in the course of Gallus's vain attempt to win Nella for himself when he, as if by accident, lets his coat fall open, and displays his orders :—

NELLA.

Monsieur, si vous croyez me faire de l'effet  
Parce que vous ouvrez votre habit de manière  
A montrer un crachat sous votre boutonnierre,  
Et dans votre gilet le coin d'un cordon bleu,  
Vous vous trompez.

Then, showing him a full-length portrait of a field-marshall covered with decorations, she adds, "Voici mon grand-père." Here there is, it seems to us, a curious instance of that dramatic *flair*, which, combined of course with far greater qualities, has availed to make of so ludicrously constructed a play as *Hernani* a drama which is notwithstanding so admirably effective. Along with this dramatic instinct we find in *Maryarita*, as the first play in "Le Livre Dramatique" is headed, numberless beauties of insight and description which it is impossible to do more than briefly refer to.

In the second drama, which is called generally *Esca*, and is subdivided into *Lison* and *La Marquise Zabeth*, we have Gallus still on his strange quest, which in this instance, in one sense at least, is more successful than the former one. This time he comes in the forest upon a clever and fascinating peasant girl named Lison. She is an orphan and penniless, and is betrothed to the comparatively rich husbandman Harou, for whom, however, she has no real love. She is of a fantastic and romantic turn of mind, has dreams of luxury and splendour, and cherishes the notion of the sudden appearance of a fairy prince to save her from her fate. As she prepares her bridal toilet she reflects that

L'œil est d'autant plus doux que la main est plus blanche,  
L'amour, dit l'Amadis de Monsieur de Tressan,  
C'est la vie. Et je hais le parler payan.  
Ouvrière. Orpheline. Oh ! je songe, et Dieu laisse  
Entrer dans mon œil trouble un regard de duchesse.  
Et j'ai des visions folles, plaire, charmer,  
Etre libre, être belle, être adorée ! Aimer !

The chance quickly comes of realizing some at least of these visions. Gallus is on the watch, and so arranges matters that Lison finds herself actually living in her dream of the fairy prince, with luxuries and splendours rising as if by enchantment around her. The prince himself, however, though brilliant enough—she takes him at first for Satan—is not young. At the end of the act she makes her choice between Harou's reeking cart and Gallus's magnificent chariot. "Mais," she asks as it comes on the stage, "à qui donc ce carrosse ?"

GALLUS.

A vous.

LISON.

A moi !

*Le carrosse s'arrête. Gunich ouvre la portière. Gallus abat le marche-pied et y fait monter Lise éperdue.*

GALLUS.

Viens ! c'est . . . ta voiture de noce !

In the second act Lison, now known as La Marquise Zabeth, is installed in a splendid house in Paris. She has crowds of real or pretended admirers, some of whose slighting phrases concerning herself she overhears from time to time and notes with a marked eagerness. Gallus meanwhile occupies himself in devising every kind of scheme for her gratification, but carefully avoids letting her know that he is so employed, and with practised cynicism denies to Gunich the imputation of having allowed his heart to be really touched by his new acquisition. In the end Zabeth dismisses the crowd of fops who flutter about her, and, left alone with

Gallus, lets loose her passionate misery in one of the finest dramatic speeches that M. Hugo has ever written. It is, unhappily, too long for quotation in its entirety. She ends, having drawn a picture of what her life is and what it might have been, with the words :—

Vous êtes prince et vieux, deux choses que je hais,  
Eh bien, pourtant, peut-être, hélas ! nos vains souhaits.  
Gardent au fond de l'ombre une porte fermée,  
Je vous aurais aimé si vous m'aviez aimée !

GALLUS.

Mais—

ZABETH.

C'est fini. Silence ! Avoir rêvé le ciel,  
Et s'éveiller avec l'arrière-goût du fiel,  
Et de tous les affronts sentir qu'on est la cible !  
Hélas ! vous m'avez fait le cœur noir et terrible,  
Soyez maudit.

Then, before Gallus can prevent it, she poisons herself with a ring that she has filched from him.

GALLUS.

Ciel ! mais c'est un poison ! la mort terrible et prompte !

ZABETH.

Boire la mort n'est rien quand on a bu la honte.  
*Elle s'affaisse sur un fauteuil.*

Adieu ! je prends mon vol, triste oiseau des forêts.  
Personne ne m'aima. Je meurs.

*Elle expire.*

GALLUS.

*Se jetant à ses pieds.*

Je t'adorais !

It is, of course, impossible by means of comments and extracts to do anything like justice to the deep and fine impression produced by the play, which has, it may be mentioned in passing, a curious likeness to Musset's best work. The names of two players at the Théâtre Français who might give it admirable interpretation on the stage may probably occur to many readers. That it is admirably fitted for stage representation—with, of course, some trifling alterations—will be obvious to any one who takes the trouble to consider the matter.

We have left ourselves comparatively little room wherein to speak of "Le Livre Lyrique" and "Le Livre Epique." The former is as full of beauty, tenderness, and imagination as any of the poet's former work in the same direction. One extract, however, must suffice :—

Un hymne harmonieux sort des feuilles du tremble ;  
Les voyageurs craintront, qui vont la nuit ensemble,  
Haussent la voix dans l'ombre où l'on doit se hâter.  
Laissez tout ce qui tremble

Chanter.

Les marins fatigués sommeillent sur le gouffre.  
La mer bleue ou Vézue épanche ses flots de souffre  
Se tait, dès qu'il s'éteint, et cesse de gémir.  
Laissez tout ce qui souffre

Dormir.

Quand la vie est mauvaise on la rêve meilleure ;  
Des yeux en pleurs au ciel se lèvent à toute heure ;  
L'espoir vers Dieu se tourne et Dieu l'entend crier.  
Laissez tout ce qui pleure

Prier.

C'est pour renaitre ailleurs qu'ici-bas on succombe,  
Tout ce qui tourbillonne appartient à la tombe.  
Il faut dans le grand tout tôt ou tard s'absorber.  
Laissez tout ce qui tombe

Tomber !

To the splendid conception and execution of "Le Livre Epique" it is quite impossible to give anything like an adequate notion within our limits. The daring idea of the midnight march of the three statues, headed by that of Henri Quatre, is just such an idea as M. Hugo alone of living poets can handle with the power and, in some sense, the restraint necessary. In his estimate of the characters of the dead kings he is, it need hardly be said, completely unfettered by purely historical considerations. But that is no check upon the tremendous swing and force of the verse that carry the reader completely away, and make him see before his eyes the terrible ride that the poet describes. We are tempted to quote the terse and dramatic conclusion of this fine work; but it is perhaps best that readers should know it either in its entirety or not at all.

#### CORAL ISLANDS.\*

M. COOPER'S *Coral Islands* is a most pleasing book, written with vivacity without flippancy, and equally interesting to the ethnologist, the capitalist, and the general reader who only wants to be amused. The author has lived for some years among the innumerable islands of the Pacific, in the middle of a mixed world of trade, lotus-eating, cannibalism, and orthodox dissent. He is convinced that the "Anglo-Saxon" has a great work to do in the Pacific Islands, and that the capitalist will eventually find there particularly excellent business. Yet, though he has a noble eye for the main chance, Mr. Cooper is not one of those irritating colonists who think that the chief end of the white man is to make money in a hurry, and the chief end of men, not white, to be used up as "labour" in the process. He is entirely on the side of Sir

\* *Coral Islands*. By H. Stonewell Cooper. London: Richard Bentley & Son. 1880.

Arthur Gordon and his policy in the Pacific—a policy which, if successful, will enable the native races to escape slavery on one side, and the fate of the Red Indians and Australians on the other. Mr. Cooper knows that his defence of the Governor of Fiji will irritate many personal friends of his among the planters. But he has seen both sides of the question, has estimated the interests concerned, and seems to have no doubt that the policy of governing as if coloured races had a right to exist in their own islands is the wise and just one.

Mr. Cooper is not a professed ethnologist, and much of his information about the past of the half-civilized races, and about their traditions and religion, he borrows from Ellis, Mariner, and others. But his testimony as to the actual condition of the lower races is authentic and at first hand. He follows Mr. Whitmee, a missionary, in his division of the peoples of the Polynesian Islands into three stocks. First we have the Papuans, "a black, frizzily-haired people, who are the lowest type of humanity in existence." We do not think the Papuans are quite so low. Regnard says that, next to the monkey, the Laplander is the animal which most nearly approaches man. Papuans seem a better developed set of people than Laplanders. Mr. Cooper says the Papuans "possess few of the traditions, poems, and songs common to many barbarous races." But Mr. Codrington has lately published many very valuable examples of traditions from the Melanesian Group, where the people, on the whole, are Papuan. Wherever one finds Papuans they are more or less mixed with a "large, brown, straight-haired people," especially in the Fiji group, which is minutely described in Mr. Cooper's work. The large, brown, straight-haired people Mr. Whitmee calls "Sawaiori," a word made up out of a syllable each from Samoa, Hawaii, and Maori. The Sawaioris are very polite, and much given to ceremonial. The chiefs, like the blessed gods in Homer, speak a language different from that of ordinary mortals. "In Samoa there are four different words for 'to come,' appropriated to four grades of people—*sau* for a common man; *malin mai* for a person of respectability; *susu mai* for a titled chief; and *afio mai* for a member of the royal family." The third of Mr. Cooper's and Mr. Whitmee's races is styled Tarapon, and its members are brown in colour, but smaller than the Sawaioris. They chiefly inhabit the Gilbert and Caroline groups. Mr. Whitmee thinks that the ancestors of all these peoples originally lived together in the isles of the Indian Archipelago. But to consider this would be to consider too curiously.

The Pacific Islands are no longer very distant from civilized lands. A run of seven days brings one from San Francisco to Honolulu, the capital of the Hawaiian kingdom. Some American missionaries first tried to Christianize the Hawaiians; but Kamehameha ordered them to throw themselves from a mountain peak as a test of the divinity of their message. This was illogical, for the truth of a string of metaphysical propositions cannot be tested by jumping off a rock. The American missionaries, therefore, declined to jump, and Hawaii remained heathen. As we all know, Kaluakua is now king, and he has an army of no fewer than two hundred efficient soldiers, armed with the Remington breechloader. We must, therefore, try to avoid quarrels with Hawaii, as they could only end in abject apologies on our part. The Hawaiians, like the Boers, are averse to labour, and import Chinese coolies, who have no reason to complain of their wages or their lot.

The Fiji Group is much more important, and Mr. Cooper believes that it will prove a most valuable possession. Viti Levu, the largest island, is larger than Cyprus, and even the second island is ten times as big as Barbadoes, while the whole area of the isles is greater than that of the British West Indies. Fiji was ceded to England by the desire of Cacobau the king, or one of the kings, and Maafu, "the Bismarck of the Pacific," in 1874. The natives have not yet insisted on its being restored, so it still remains a jewel in the British crown. Cacobau had various reasons for giving up his sceptre; the chief, perhaps, was that the Americans had established an ingenious claim against him, a claim, according to our Commissioners, "unfairly made and unfairly pressed, and which has led to speculations of a questionable character." The speculators were natives of Melbourne. The white settlers in Fiji were also anxious for annexation, though, now they have got it, many of them do not like it. The introduction of measles in 1875 by her Majesty's ship *Dido* was an act of atrocious carelessness, which produced the most miserable results. In 1876 there was a "final cannibal outbreak," the conservative highland tribes attacking and eating a number of native Christians. Mr. Cooper takes a sanguine view of the future of civilization and of Christianity in Fiji. If the recent accounts of a massacre by Christians be correct, we may have reason to fear lest the natives, like the Boers and the Maoris, should exclusively adopt the early Hebrew theory of the duty of massacre. Levuka, the capital of Fiji, has made great strides in civilization, and possesses a cricket-ground and a School Board. There is also a "Temperance Hall," but rigid abstainers are still in a minority. One Fijian chief boasts that he drinks a bottle of brandy every day, which, in a hot climate, seems to approach excess. Another commonly manages two bottles of gin, which he drinks out of a cocoa-nut shell. And yet the native population of Fiji is not increasing. Chickens and turkeys and beef are cheap. In Levuka mullets are killed, we regret to say, by dynamite. But the great charm of Levuka, after the pools beneath the waterfalls where people bathe, is the entire absence of tall hats. There is not one in the colony, and the only specimen was pitched into the sea.

Fijian and Samoan legends of the Creation are very much like our own. They have the Flood, Cain and Abel, and so forth. Mr. Cooper is half tempted to see in these traditions some faint remains of Hebrew influence. But, as the stories are common to almost all known races, it seems safer not to speculate on the influence of the Mosaic history. Among the sacred stones, as common in Fiji as in ancient Greece, was one which always had a little pebble when any woman of rank was confined in the Fijian capital. The mother-stone was taken away when Christianity was introduced, but the pebbles remain to testify to the

So much has been written lately about Fijian cannibalism by Miss Gordon Cumming and others that we need not quote Mr. Cooper's account of revolting practices. He himself dislikes the topic. He gives a very amusing description (vol. i. p. 96) of the want of rancour displayed by warlike Fijians. "I tried to shoot you," one of them said to Mr. Harding, speaking of a battle, "but you put a revolver bullet through my hand. My brother shot you in the breast, and then you shot him with your little gun between the eyes. . . . You killed my uncle, but my cousin put a bullet through your shirt." The Fijians, like other southern people, are supposed to use poisoned arrows in war, and they certainly do their best to envenom their arrow-heads, which are usually made of sharp human bones. But the experiment of inoculating rabbits and other animals with the poisons used has been tried, and the results seem to show that these are not really efficacious. If a native has been hit by the arrow of a man who has *mana*, or magical power, he gives himself up for lost, and dies accordingly.

The "labour question" and the question of taxation are the great practical problems of Fijian life. It is not easy to ascertain how far "blackbirding" or cooley-stealing prevailed before the annexation. Mr. Cooper's own accounts of the matter seem rather inconsistent. At present the Governor does his best to secure the return of imported labourers to their homes when their term has expired. Mr. Cooper thinks that these half-civilized returned emigrants raise the moral tone of their neighbours. It is certain that the Solomon Islanders seem to have become rather more than less savage during recent years. An amusing story is told of an imported Polynesian nurse who returned to her own people after she had served her time. A "recruiting agent" met her, and asked her if she would return to Fiji.

"Well," said the girl, "I like it, but I don't know if my pa will let me go."

"Oh, I see the old folk live here, eh?"

"My pa live here, but ma's dead."

"Oh, how did the old lady die?"

"Gentleman come visiting, and pa get jealous; so he fight and kill ma; then he put her in a *lovo* (or oven) and pa and his friends eat poor ma all up."

The Fijians are at present obliged to pay their taxes either in labour or in kind. This plan does not at all suit the white planters. The natives can only get money by working for the planters, and, if they were obliged to pay taxes in money, for the planters they would be compelled to work. Now the article of commerce known as copra was, according to Sir Arthur Gordon, sold to Government by traders at 10*l.* 10*s.* 6*d.* a ton. For the same article traders paid natives 5*l.* a ton. Thus, if the native is taxed ten shillings worth of copra annually, he has only to pay 10*lb.*; but, if he had to pay ten shillings in money, he would have to sell 22*lb.* to the trader to raise his half-sovereign. So far, then, the native has the better of the bargain under the present system. A planter admitted to Sir Arthur Gordon that the natives "are very much better off than they were three years ago; but he added that this was by no means an advantage to the planter, whose difficulties in obtaining labour were thereby materially increased." It may be inferred that Sir Arthur Gordon is regarded as a piling humanitarian by the majority of planters. But Mr. Cooper entirely approves of his policy, as a consequence of which, he says, Polynesian labourers are now flocking to Fiji, a country which they previously distrusted.

Mr. Cooper gives a long list of Fijian products, and a business-like appendix with a tariff of customs. In his opinion the islands offer a great field for capital. "What Fiji requires is, in fact, an aristocracy of planters, who will add to a very natural desire to create a competence a keen sense of responsibility to all around, whether white or coloured." Working-men and City clerks are not wanted; the latter are "a nuisance in Fiji." Men should have, at the very least, a capital of three or four hundred pounds. From personal knowledge of the subject, we can say that a small capital and a stout heart did not by any means lead to wealth in the earlier and more unsettled days of Fiji. Things may be improving, doubtless are improving; and Mr. Cooper writes:—"I am inclined to think that there is no colony of the British Empire where a young man, coupling a reasonable amount of brains with a moderate capital, can so easily secure a competence as in Fiji." Mr. Cooper adds plenty of practical hints for emigrants. The rest of his book—his account of beach-combers, pirates, of the pearl-fisheries, of the monuments on Easter Island—is as entertaining as his chapters on Fiji are instructive.

## MY SISTER THE ACTRESS.\*

THE duties of a reviewer of novels are not always disagreeable. He occasionally meets with works worth reading, and then to give short accounts of the leading points of the stories, so as to excite the reader's curiosity without allowing it to be gratified until he shall have procured and read the books for himself, is pleasant work enough. There is also a pleasure in giving a few well-selected and amusing extracts, which shall keep the anxious reader's mind from starving until he may succeed in getting the novel from the circulating libraries; and there is an art which, if not easy, is decidedly agreeable, in writing an article that shall tell readers enough of a book to enable them to talk about it without spoiling their interest in reading it for themselves. It is always pleasanter, moreover, to praise than to blame, and a critic who says a good word for a book has the double satisfaction of reflecting that he has done a service both to the author and to the herd of readers who are always wanting to know of some book worth sending for. There would be no use in disguising the fact that there is also some pleasure to be derived from reviewing an exceedingly foolish book. There are novels published in these days containing such surpassing nonsense that they amuse by their very absurdity, and, if not witty in themselves, they become the cause of wit in others. Unfortunately there are other novels which come under neither of these descriptions. There is one kind especially which it is neither pleasant to read nor to review. This is the thoroughly vulgar novel. In some instances novels of this sort are decidedly clever and provokingly amusing. There are many passages, for example, in *Soapie Sponge* and *Plain or Ringlets* which can scarcely fail to amuse, although they may irritate. But there are novels which are both vulgar and weak, irritating and dull.

On the fourth page of the first volume of the book before us we read that "it is so difficult to be vulgar when you never open your mouth." We beg to differ. There are people who find it exceedingly easy to be vulgar with closed mouths, when they have pens in their hands. Of all kinds of vulgarity, that connected with chambers of death and funerals is to our thinking the most nauseating. In the fourth and fifth chapters of the book under notice there are descriptions of a most unpleasant death-scene, the preparations for a funeral, the visits of friends to the laid-out body, the carrying of the coffin downstairs, the assembling of the mourners for the funeral, the summoning of the bearers, the carrying of the body out of the house, and the marshalling of the party into the mourning coaches. We read of "a faint pervading odour of eau de Cologne," of "deep crepe veils," of a "buxom widow" "decorously draped in the deepest mourning," of "the coffin with its silent inmate," of the "marble image," "the Silent Presence," and "the funeral guests." We were almost tempted to think as we finished the fifth chapter that *My Brother the Undertaker* would have been a more suitable title for the book than *My Sister the Actress*. We are bound to say that there is nothing more about funerals in the succeeding chapters, and we were not without a certain feeling of relief when the heroine's mother, who is spoken of as "the sick lady," died, and had the advantage of a respectable funeral. Unfortunately she leaves a sister behind her, a woman who had a "gushing, affectionate heart," as well as several other relations whom the author might with advantage have buried decently in the early chapters while in a burying humour.

The heroine is, of course, my sister the actress, who performs some of those noble actions which it is so easy to make heroines perform in a novel. She marries the right man at last, although she treats him in rather a scurvy manner in the second volume. At one time she falls deeply in love with "beautiful man," who is "as handsome as a star," and "looks as if he had just stepped from his bath perfumed and anointed, and put on everything fresh and clean." This beautiful man's "arm steals round her lissom waist," when she gently remonstrates with "Pray don't! Indeed you mustn't." After this backstairs sort of scramble there is no saying what might have happened if the perfumed and anointed beauty had not bolted with the bosom friend of the lissom waist. The accounts of the heroine's attacks of love-sickness—for they deserve no higher name—read very like descriptions of indigestion. In chapter ix. we find her "lying on her bed, face downwards, with a vast new feeling pervading her breast." The idea of a vast new feeling pervading the breast is sufficiently horrible, but we pity the heroine still more when we read that "there is a hard lump in her throat" "and a heavy weight upon her bosom." Her affection for the young man who looked as if he had just stepped from his bath attained to such a pitch at one time that we are told she had a "heart welling over with love" for him. When her pericardium is in this overcharged condition she is apt to be violent, for we read that "she flings herself into his arms with a passionate gesture." Although we are told most about her bosom, her breast, and her heart, we are informed, in the early part of the first volume, that she also had a brain. One of her friends describes her as "disgustingly clever," and she takes five prizes on one day at school, or rather at "college." English grammar must have been rather neglected at this college, for the five-prize-taker says to a friend, "Surely you will never marry him—not if you hate him"; to another person she says "Never you mind"; and she has a charming sister who says "I couldn't, not now."

While the heroine is deeply in love with the anointed beauty, she accords some minor attentions to a gentleman to whom she is engaged to be married; indeed, in one place we read that "she takes, at this juncture, almost to courting" him; although at other junctures she flirts outrageously with the anointed one, and she "cogitates earnestly with her heart what to say to him next." Her love passages with the man whom she eventually marries remind one of that peculiar social arrangement known to servants as "keeping company." She was not particularly in love with him, but she walked regularly with him in Hyde Park, and he was allowed to consider her to a great extent his own property; but she was much relieved when something happened to save her for a time from listening, "with a callous ear to his long-winded tale of love," and from being "called upon to give him kisses on demand, or to sit close to him on a sofa and pretend to like it." The youth who tells the long-winded love tales is the son and heir of a baronet, but he astonishes us by telling the heroine when he meets her accidentally in the country that his "father's seat" is only three miles off. Hitherto, we have never enjoyed the felicity of knowing any young men who talked about their "father's seats," but on this point the author has the advantage of us. The happy youth had a very prudish old grandmother. We were prepared for any amount of stiffness and primness in this old lady, and were consequently not a little surprised when, talking of evening dresses, she asked what she called her favourite riddle. "When is a lady not a lady? When she is a little bear!" It will be perceived that even the Grundyism of these volumes is peculiar; but then all the characters in the book are quite different from what the author calls "the *oi polloi*." Even their surroundings are not as those of other mortals. We are told of "a bright May day, warm, sunny, and perfumed." We confess that we are not aesthetic enough to wish for a perfumed day. Hitherto, indeed, we have never experienced one; but we remember once reading in *Punch* of a barber out on a holiday, who told his wife that the scent of the wild flowers reminded him "of the most delicious 'air-oil.'" A large proportion of the characters in this novel are the kind of people whom one would expect to be redolent of peppermint and patchouli, and their days would probably be perfumed in that sense of the word. It is satisfactory to read of mansions "replete with every luxury, and provided with an ample retinue of servants," but one cannot help wondering what manner of people speak after this fashion. Perhaps this sort of fine language may be common among "an ample retinue of servants." We do not think it necessary that we should give a sketch of the plot of the story. It will be perceived that we have refrained from offering any criticism on the book, as we have thought it sufficient to point out what seem to us to be its leading characteristics. We cannot pretend to say whether *My Sister the Actress* will be much read. In these days there appear to be people who will read any description of rubbish.

## WARD AND LOCK'S ETYMOLOGICAL DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.\*

THE now forgotten Etymological Dictionary by "N. Bailey, Φλογός," which long held its place as the guide and instructor of intelligent country squires, states on its title-page that it has been "compiled and methodically digested, as well for the Entertainment of the Curious as the Information of the Ignorant, and for the Benefit of young Students, Artificers, Tradesmen, and Foreigners, who are desirous thoroughly to understand what they speak, read, or write." Messrs. Ward and Lock have evidently aspired to bring out a new Bailey, "a Popular and Comprehensive Guide to the Pronunciation, Parts of Speech, Meaning, and Etymology of all Words—Ordinary, Scientific, and Technological—now in General Use." They have not indeed, in emulation of Bailey, undertaken to give "our most common Proverbs, with their Explication," but in exchange—an ill exchange, as some may think—they have given interpretations of the penny-a-liner's favourite scraps of Latin, French, Italian, and Spanish. This part of the book we own that we wish away. We "hold that man the worst of public foes"—from a philologist's point of view—who does anything to encourage the spread of that polyglot jargon which is so dear to the London correspondents of country newspapers and to the authors employed by enterprising cheap tailors. But letting this pass for the moment, we are glad to see the appearance of this etymological Dictionary. It is a sign of healthy state of things when "young Students, Artificers, Tradesmen" "are desirous thoroughly to understand what they speak, read, or write." It is a good sign too, when the average Englishman, for whom Messrs. Ward and Lock's cheap publications are intended, takes sufficient interest in his own language to care about its etymology. And as far as we have been able to test it, the guide now offered to him is a fairly trustworthy one—why by the way could not the author of the pre-

\* *Ward and Lock's Standard Etymological Dictionary of the English Language: a Popular and Comprehensive Guide to the Pronunciation, Parts of Speech, Meanings, and Etymology of all Words—Ordinary, Scientific, and Technological—now in General Use.* With an Appendix, comprising I. Abbreviations used in Writing and Printing. II. A Brief Classical Dictionary, comprising the Principal Deities, Heroes, Notable Men and Women, &c., of Greek and Roman Mythology. III. Letters: how to Begin, End, and Address them. IV. Words, Phrases, and Proverbs from the Latin, frequently used in Writing and Speaking. V. Words, Phrases, and Proverbs from the French, with English Translations. VI. Words, Phrases, and Proverbs from the Italian and Spanish, with English Translations. With 500 Illustrations, illustrative of Various Words, Names, and Processes. London: Ward, Lock, & Co.

face have contented himself with the good word *trustworthy* instead of the barbarous *reliable*? There is of course much that is open to criticism; for the matter of that, etymology is a growing and still imperfectly understood science, and the utmost that can as yet be said of any etymological dictionary is that it contains fewer errors than its predecessors. When the long-promised dictionary which is to be the result of the labours of the Philological Society appears, we may hope, not indeed to arrive at perfect knowledge, but to know all that is to be known at the time on the subject. Meanwhile we have nothing which holds an equal place with Littré's great work. We cannot go the length of saying that the book before us is even as good a compilation as could possibly be made. Except in some few happy instances, popular works lag some little way behind the point attained by the foremost scholars, and this Dictionary is not altogether an exception to the rule. "Reference," the compiler tells us, "has been made to all the best English Dictionaries of modern times, including those of Webster, Worcester, Ogilvie, and many others that are generally accepted as reliable authorities"; but we see no traces of acquaintance with Littré and Brachet, whose dictionaries should, of course, have been consulted for all words derived from or akin to French. In short, we do not consider this a first-rate work; but it is a fair performance of the second class, and—which, after all, is considerable praise—will do more good than harm.

Our criticisms begin with the wish that Messrs. Ward and Lock could, consistently with cheapness and profit, allow their readers a larger, or at least a blacker and less crowded type. Learning is most excellent; but short sight is, as the Germans are beginning to feel, a heavy price to pay for it. As however we have already lifted up our voice with reference to the same firm's reprint of Cobbett's Grammar, we say no more. The "Introductory Remarks" of the compiler next engage our attention. He judiciously disclaims any intention of asserting that his work

embraces within its pages every word that *may* be introduced into a so-called English Dictionary; for it is possible to swell the bulk of a work of this kind to almost any extent by bringing in words which are nothing more than words from ancient and modern languages in an Anglicised form, which are useless in themselves, inasmuch as they are not in use at all, and in all probability never will be.

With this remark any one will agree who knows the multitude of "inkhorn terms" with which Bailey and others of his class swelled out their works, and which have been slavishly copied by one compiler after another. The claim of the present work is that "it contains every word whose meaning it is necessary that a well-read and well-educated Englishman should know," which is perhaps rather too strong an assertion on the part of a book which confines itself to "terms now in general use." The well-educated Englishman should be familiar with the Bible and Prayer-book use of "prevent," as in the collect, "Prevent us, O Lord, in all our doing," or in the Epistle to the Thessalonians, "we which . . . remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep." "Anticipate," the explanation here given, hardly expresses its full meaning. He should know that *riches* was originally a singular noun, so that he may not blame the Revisers of the New Testament, as we have lately seen them blamed, for retaining in Colossians i. 27, "To whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery." *Teen* (sorrow), as a Shakspearian word, should have a place in his Dictionary. Here we only find the colloquial sense of "Teens, years between twelve and twenty." Of course there are dangers on the other side. It was doubtless by referring to some dictionary which gave only the archaic sense of *teen* that some ingenious Frenchman was led to translate the opening words of *Vanity Fair*, "The present century was in its teens," as "le siècle était dans les larmes." *Terrier* should be given in its legal as well as its canine sense; and *barb*, meaning a Barbary horse, should not have been left out. As it is, the inquirer who is curious as to the nature of the gallant barbs which appear in company with the heroes of Scott and Byron, has to take his choice among the "beard or something resembling it," arrow-heads, fish-hooks, and horse-trappings.

The Introduction, from which we have already quoted, contains some useful grammatical notes. It would, however, have been better to describe the indefinite article *a* as a contraction of the original *an*. To repeat the statement of the old grammars that "*an* is used for euphony," &c., confirms the common and erroneous impression that *a* has been lengthened into *an*, instead of *an* being shortened into *a*. Strong and weak verbs should also have been explained; the compiler is content with the old notions of regular and irregular. In the matter of etymology the plan followed has been "that of giving one, two, or more words to which each English word can be positively traced, or from which, by reason of its apparent affinity, it may fairly be supposed to be derived." The compiler adds that in some cases "the derivations given are intended merely as being suggestive." For a popular work it would, we think, have been a better plan, in the case of words coming direct from the Old-English or "Anglo-Saxon," to have given the earliest form, without encumbering the learner with German, Dutch, Latin, or Greek cognates, and to have shown the stages by which it passed into its present form. The tendency of the plan actually followed will be, we fear, to confirm the learner in the common notion that modern English is as nearly related to German, Dutch, or even French, as it is to "Anglo-Saxon." The one thing that ought to be got into people's heads, if possible, is that modern English is simply "Anglo-Saxon" in a later stage of growth. Glancing over the

etymology, we note that in one or two cases the actual parent of the word under consideration has been omitted, though the more remote ancestor is named. The Latin *albus* is given as the source of *albino*, without any mention of its immediate Spanish or Portuguese origin. So *amour* is assigned to *amor*, without any hint that it is pure French, and only Latin at second-hand. *Introit* should have had its direct origin, the Latin *introitus*, acknowledged, before it was analysed into *intro*, *itum*, and *eo*. We doubt whether *ancient*, in the senses of flag and flag-bearer, should be traced to *ancien* and *antique*. It is more probably a corrupt form of *asign*. The common derivation, here adopted, of *antimony* from *anti-moine*, because some unspecified monks were poisoned by it, has a very apocryphal sound. It would have been better to derive it from the barbarous Latin *antimonium*, which Littré has traced to Arabic and Greek sources. Littré should also have been consulted for the etymology of *albatross*, *arsenal*, *bastard*, *carcanet*, and *escort*. The last, which is here assigned to the Latin *cohors*, really comes, through the Italian *scorta* and *scorgere*, from *ex-corrigere*, to direct. *Capstan* is rightly traced through the French to the Latin *capra*; but it should have been explained that *capra* is to be understood as an engine, not literally as a goat. On the other hand, the compiler has been wise in placing *lark*, a frolic, in connexion with *lark*, a bird, instead of following those who attempt to trace it to the Old-English *lacán*, to play, which lives in the North-country dialects as *layke*. Attractive as this etymology is, it seems very doubtful whether it can be justified on any sound principle. Why under the head *Ban-dog* the reader should be referred to *Ban* we cannot tell, as none of the meanings assigned to that word have any obvious connexion with a dog. At the same time it must be admitted that the more usual explanation of *Ban-dog*, *quasi bandog*, i.e. dog tied up, is not very satisfactory. We must give the compiler due praise for explaining *decimate*, *dilapidate*, and *oration* accurately; and his interpretation of *transpired* in the figurative sense as "become known or public," is a fair one, though the Johnsonian interpretation, "to escape from secrecy to notice," would have been preferable. Our modern newspaper-writers have quite forgotten that the idea of escaping, exhaling, oozing out as it were, is conveyed by this word; and a witness cannot so much as give his name and address without its being reported that "it transpired" that his name was John Smith of such and such a place. English usage must, we suppose, excuse *forte* and *morale*, though a Frenchman would write *fort* and *moral*—that is, if he was speaking of the *moral* of an army. "Moral condition; mental state, as of men, especially in time of trial," is the explanation here given. This is properly *le moral*; *la morale* being morality, which is a different thing. In the phrase "on the tapis" it would have been well to explain that *tapis* here means a carpet in the sense of a table-cloth, not of a floor-cloth. *Enceinte* is oddly described as "the projecting part of any system of fortification"; perhaps *surrounding* was meant, though even this would not make much sense. *Cap-à-pie* is given twice over, once in the English part, where it is in its place as an English idiom taken from old French, and again in the glossary of awfully French phrases, where it should have been noted that modern French usage demands *de pied en cap*. But this glossary altogether requires correction, for we find in it *A l'outrance*, *C'est en fait de lui*, *Couïe qui couïe*, *Le mot d'étrange*, and that barbarous piece of English-French, *double-entendre*. By what rule it has been settled that one thing is French and another is English we cannot make out. *Hors de combat* is placed among English words, while *peine forte et dure*, which has at least an English history, is relegated to the French glossary. It is as well that in this latter part the compiler has abandoned the attempt to teach pronunciation, though in the body of the work he does his best, with but moderate success. *Ang-bong-pvong* does not seem very happily to represent the sound of *embonpoint*, nor *hor de kong'bar* of *hors de combat*. In the cases of *abbé* and *employé* the learner might have had a better chance if the words had been printed with their accents. To come to an English word, it would not have struck us that *A-guen* conveyed the proper sound of *agone*, but we admit that we have not heard the word used in ordinary conversation. At any rate, we part in charity from the compiler, seeing that he has been careful to mark the proper sound of the *wh* in *what* and *where*.

#### VOLCANOES.\*

PROFESSOR JUDD modestly announces himself in the preface to his present excellent work as the scientific executor of the late Mr. Poulett Scrope in carrying forward the knowledge and investigation of the subject to which that eminent geologist devoted so much of his life. Many years have elapsed since Scrope's death, and since he worked and wrote much has been done to enlarge and confirm the basis of facts and observations upon which must rest any true theory of volcanic action and of the cognate phenomena of earthquakes. Very extensive additions have been made to the relative geographical information by ascertaining the position and mutual bearings of active volcanoes in all regions of the globe, the number of which, and of what may be called semi-volcanic districts, is far greater than was formerly supposed. A more precise and differential examination

\* *Volcanoes: What they Are and What they Teach.* By John W. Judd, F.R.S., Professor of Geology in the Royal School of Mines, London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1881.

has been made of the various rocks and minerals which are the slow results or immediate products of volcanic energy, and these are now better understood and more correctly classified than was formerly the case. Chemical analysis and microscopic work have also contributed to an improved knowledge of their real constitution and of the probable conditions under which they have been evolved and have assumed their present aspects. The latest instrument of research, the spectroscope, has lent its aid, and assisted in the comparison between what is actually going on in the interior of and upon the surface of our own planet, and what has been or is being transacted in the sun and other bodies of the great system to which the earth belongs. Above all, the history of the past has been carefully looked up, read, and digested, so as to explain much of what would be inexplicable, if attention were only directed to modern or recent exhibitions of volcanic action. In this, as in other departments of physical science, the immense advantage is to be noted of a concentrated attack by different branches of the service, so to speak, belonging to the powerful army now enlisted in that great warfare in which the conquest of truth is the only glory and the annexation of fresh facts and of more extended inductions is the most coveted prize.

It is nearly a century since Spallanzani visited and described the volcanoes of Italy, and these have since engaged the attention of other eminent men; but it was not until the year 1826 that Scrope's well-known treatise gave the first systematic view of the subject. It was Spallanzani who pointed out that the nature of volcanic action remains the same, however much its intensity may vary from time to time; and if this is accepted as a central truth, a great advance will be made in the facility of grouping around it many phenomena which otherwise might seem to be at variance with each other, and indeed not to belong to the same order of things. All subsequent discovery and reflection have tended to confirm this axiom. Stromboli has for the whole historical period of two thousand years been in a state of constant activity, but has never broken out into the violent eruptions which have distinguished Vesuvius and Etna, nor has it ever relapsed into absolute quiescence or extinction. Its accessible position and comparatively tranquil behaviour have always made it a desirable spot for the study of volcanic life. There may be seen all the familiar sights and sounds of the volcano; the crater and the lava stream, the ejected showers of molten rock, assuming the form of scoriae as they cool in falling, and the enormous evolution of steam, which forms the huge masses of so-called smoke which hang over a volcano during eruption, and is the most probable source of the vast mechanical power which lifts the column of fused mineral matter from its subterranean reservoir and drives it over the lips of the brimming cup. Thence it runs down the sides of the mountain within which it has risen, still apparently smoking and bursting with included steam, to ravage the neighbourhood, to be the terror of the day, and to become in after ages the instruction and wonder of the future geologist, under the form of a basalt, a trachyte, or of some other plutonic rock.

The general history of the volcanic centres which have been most under observation tends to show that long periods of inactivity are followed by eruptions of long duration or of great violence, and the reverse. Feeble and brief eruptions succeed at short intervals; and, as a rule, the violence of a great eruption is inversely proportional to its duration. This sort of intermittent action obviously resembles that of the Geyser springs in Iceland and elsewhere, which may fairly be described as hot-water volcanoes, and to a considerable extent it is consistent with the supposition that the actual eruptive manifestations of volcanic force are due to the escape of high-pressure steam, imprisoned in the interior of the earth, and waiting for an opportunity of diminished pressure to escape. Unquestionably steam does bear a considerable part in eruptions; and the unseen operation of water at enormous temperatures, and subject to immense subterranean pressure, must be held to assist in the widely-spread modifications of the earth's crust, of which volcanoes and earthquakes are the casual and not the most important indications. But much more knowledge is required before the steam theory can be definitely accepted, although it presents a greater aspect of probability than any other yet put forward and supported by observation, and in his final discussion of various hypotheses Professor Judd is extremely careful in weighing the facts already collected, and refrains from giving any absolute opinion. A recent writer in the *Quarterly Review* throws out the suggestion that the volcano and the earthquake owe their existence to some hitherto unsuspected action of electricity, while at the same time he ignores the evidence of the elevation and depression of certain tracts of the earth's surface, which must be admitted and considered in connexion with any rational theory of volcanic action, and without which it cannot, in all its generality, be explained.

The microscopic examination of thin slices of various lavas has discovered unexpected points of difference in their internal structure, and has even aided to some extent in determining the date of their formation. They present much difference in their composition and texture, from that of a simple glass or obsidian to that of rock like granite, made up entirely of large crystals. The vitreous lavas also sometimes take the shape of pumice, which is nothing but the filaments or powder of glassy lava consolidated, but with innumerable cavities. The pumice of commerce is a direct natural manufacture of the Mediterranean volcanoes, from

one of which the necessary supply is always obtained. The most important conclusions to be derived from an investigation of the crystalline interior of lava, and from experiments upon the artificial fusing and cooling of such small portions as can be so operated upon, are those which prove the time necessary for the cooling of lavas and the great pressure to which they must have been subjected. Further evidence of enormous pressure, either exercised by steam, or by the lateral thrust of adjoining rocks, or by the weight of superincumbent mineral masses, is afforded by the existence of fluids as found in the minute cavities which abound in many kinds of crystals. Each of such cavities contains some liquid and a bubble of gas, like that of air in a spirit-level; and the obvious inference is that the crystals must have been formed under a pressure capable of reducing to a liquid form some of the most volatile kinds of such matter as is usually found in an aërial form state. The further prosecution of these inquiries will not only tend to throw more light on the nature of lavas, recent and ancient, but to advance our knowledge of the way in which crystals in general, and especially metallic and mineral veins, are formed. All our precious gems are probably due to volcanic action, and to the slow crystallization under enormous pressure of small portions of some of the materials which exist in another state in the greatest abundance. Diamonds are crystallized carbon, and it is known that the largest recent discovery of them has taken place in the midst of an old volcanic region of South Africa; the ruby and sapphire are crystals of alumina; the amethyst and a number of other gems represent silica.

The more recent and familiar exhibitions of volcanic agency are well described, and Professor Judd's treatise gives an admirable account of all the most celebrated eruptions, including the remarkable elevation of Monte Nuovo to a height of 440 feet in the space of two days and nights, which affords one of the best known and most instructive instances of rapid volcanic work. More novel matter is devoted to the description of less familiar but still active volcanoes, and to the studies which have now been made of extinct craters, and of the evidences of ancient volcanic action in times which are old even when reckoned according to the calendar of accepted geological time. Under different circumstances widely different results are produced. In Hawaii, where the lava is very liquid, there are great volcanic cones rising to nearly 14,000 feet, with a base of seventy miles, and with a slope consequently of only six or eight degrees. Cotopaxi, which has been built up by continuous eruptions from the same vent, is 19,600 feet high; the height and width of the base increase together; and the vertical section is nearly that of an equilateral triangle. The great eruption in the Isle of Java in 1772 was the grandest and most terrific exhibition of the inner forces of the earth recorded in history. A cone 9,000 feet high broke out in eruption, an enormous mass of materials was ejected, and the mountain was reduced in height to 5,000 feet. These and similar eruptions are the violent but spasmodic efforts of volcanic force; but equally great or even greater results have probably been effected by the slow and continuous action of thermal springs, by which large quantities of heat must be constantly escaping from the interior of the earth, and materials removed and carried down to be ultimately redeposited at the bottom of the sea. It is calculated that the solid matter dissolved in the hot waters of Bath alone, which has by their agency been extracted from the earth during the last 2,000 years, would, if collected, form a solid cone equal to the bulk of Monte Nuovo.

The general proximity of active volcanoes to the shores of the sea has long been noticed; and recently extended observation confirms the fact, with only two considerable exceptions. For, in the centre of the vast tract of land formed by Europe and Asia—the largest unbroken one on the globe—there rise the volcanoes of the Thian Shan Range, of which, however, it is desirable that more should be known; and, on the contrary, the volcanoes of the Sandwich Islands, which are the largest in the world, rise almost in the centre of the widest ocean and from its greatest depths. But a careful study of the evidence leads to the conclusion that the proximity of the ocean to volcanic vents should be regarded not as the cause, but as the effect, of subterranean action, when regarded in its most universal aspect. Professor Judd describes mountain-chains as cicatrized wounds in the earth's crust, representing the lines of great fissures along which volcanic action has been manifested. Afterwards subsidence during long periods takes place, during which are being accumulated the future materials of the mountain-range; the effect of vast tension and pressure and of enormous heat transforms the deposited strata into hard and crystalline rocks; there is further elevation at successive epochs; and, finally, the action of water in torrents, or rain, or by frost, denudes the harder rocks and shapes out of them such masses as those of the Andes or the Alps. The time is, of course, to be counted by millions of years, and the vertical spaces to be filled in must be measured in thousands of feet; but there is nothing in the figures which need detract from the probabilities of this hypothesis. If it is accepted, it is likely that at any given time the weakest parts in the earth's crust will be along the lines of demarcation between the land and the sea, and it is here that active volcanoes would be found. To go back to an actual beginning is more than is now expected from science, which can only refer to a long series of similar changes, showing that volcanic action was at work among what are believed to be the oldest rocks. Continuous secular changes

following in similar cycles of phenomena appear to be the rule in inorganic as well as in organic existence when the former is surveyed in the large and comprehensive way necessary in dealing with the cosmical history of our globe. Earthquakes thus cease to be portentous, and take their place in the ranks of the ordinary ministers of nature; and, so viewed, they "break not heaven's design," as Pope has hypothetically said of them in his well-known comparison between the moral and physical evils of the world.

Much valuable illustration of modern volcanic eruptions and flows of lava is supplied by Professor Judd in the descriptions of the similar events which have occurred in the paleontological history of many a well-known region. The Island of Mull, in the Hebrides, is the wreck of an ancient volcano, which had a base of thirty miles, and a height of 10,000 to 12,000 feet, but which is now degraded to hills hardly exceeding 3,000 feet. Similar dimensions are conjecturally ascribed to the great volcano at work in Tertiary times in the Island of Skye, and the physiology of volcanoes may now be studied among the extinct remains in the great museum of nature around Loch Coruisk and along the Coolin Hills; just as comparative anatomy can be often learned better from the preserved specimens in our great collections than from the living animals themselves. Such generalizations as are furnished by these studies of the geological antiquities of our own planet may be supplemented and extended by referring to the present condition of the sun and moon, and by an examination of the smaller bodies which alight upon the earth in their swoop through space, proving to how great an extent we share with them the same elements, and that in the present of the sun we may see our own past, and in the moon, with its vapourless surface, and extinct craters of unearthly dimensions, our own possible future.

MAX MÜLLER'S SACRED BOOKS OF THE EAST.  
VOL. X. PART I.

PROFESSOR MAX MÜLLER has here reached the half-way volume of his original scheme, which seems to widen as the work proceeds. This volume consists of two canonical books on Buddhism, the originals of which are written in Pāli verse. The first, *Dhammapada*, is translated by Max Müller himself; the second, *Sutta-nipāta*, is translated into English by the celebrated Danish Pāli scholar, V. Fausbøll. Both translations, therefore, are from the most competent hands. This volume is likely to prove more generally acceptable than any of the previous volumes; partly from the great and growing interest which Buddhism has won to itself, and partly from the intrinsic merits of the works themselves. The exact place of the *Dhammapada* in Pāli canonical literature has yet to be determined, for there are different and authoritative classifications of the old Buddhist works. Those who accept the division of the *Tipitaka*, or "Three Baskets"—a division very generally received—include the *Dhammapada* among them; but, whatever its classification, there is no doubt as to its great authority and universal acceptance among Buddhists. Like most Oriental works of antiquity, its date is uncertain, but somewhere about the beginning of the Christian era is the probable time of its composition. One point is certain, that the celebrated Buddhaghosa at the beginning of the fifth century wrote commentaries in which he quotes and comments upon passages of this work. Professor Müller himself cannot "see any reason why we should not treat the verses of the *Dhammapada*, if not as the utterances of Buddha, at least as what were believed by the members of the council under Asoka in 242 B.C. to have been the utterances of the founder of their religion." The internal evidence of the work is indecisive, but its tone and spirit are well worthy of Buddha himself, and the whole or a part may have been delivered by him.

The word *Dhamma* is one of many meanings, and *pada* also, in a less degree, varies in its significations. The title *Dhammapada* has been translated as "Footsteps of Religion," "Paths of Religion," and Professor Müller prefers the rendering, "Path of Virtue" or "Footstep of the Law." The *Dhammapada* has already appeared before the European world in a Latin version by Dr. Fausbøll, published in 1855,

which will mark for ever an important epoch in the history of Pāli scholarship; and though later critics have been able to point out some mistakes, both in his text and in his translation, the value of their labours is not to be compared with that of the work accomplished single handed by that eminent Danish scholar.

Professor Beal has also translated a considerable portion of the same work from the Chinese version, but this has not proved so valuable as was expected. A considerable portion of the work has also been translated by Sir Coomara Swamy of Ceylon.

So excellent a version as that of Dr. Fausbøll having been before the world for nearly thirty years, it may be asked why another translation was necessary. When Dr. Fausbøll published his work Pāli learning was in its infancy. It has since had great and rapid growth, to which the appearance of Childers's Pāli Dictionary has given a vigorous impulse. The plan of Professor Müller's series of *Sacred Books of the East* required an English version, and he is not the man to be contented with a translation from a translation, or to rest quiet while the learning of his particular

\* *The Sacred Books of the East.* Edited by F. Max Müller. *The Dhammapada and the Sutta-nipāta: Two Canonical Books of the Buddhists.* The former translated from the Pāli by F. Max Müller, and the latter by V. Fausbøll.

sphere of study has been advancing. He has made his predecessor's work the basis of his labours, and never ventures to differ from him without giving reasons and citing his authorities. There can therefore be no doubt that this translation approaches, if it does not absolutely reach, perfection, and that we are in possession of a full and accurate version of one of the earliest and most important of Buddhist works.

Whoever was the author of the *Dhammapada*, there can be no doubt that it embodies doctrines and teachings of the purest and most elevated character, which, if not promulgated by Buddha himself, must have been the composition of one of his most eminent disciples. In Dr. Fausbøll's edition the original text is printed, so also are the many extracts from Buddhaghosa's commentary which Fausbøll quoted to justify his translation. In the present volume we have only the translation, as Mr. Müller's work is devoted to translations only. The original is written in verse, in the ordinary *stoka* metre, and runs freely. It is divided into twenty-six short chapters, which contain, on the whole, four hundred and twenty-three verses. Some of the chapters are devoted to purely Buddhist doctrines, others give the Buddhist exposition of virtues and morals which are universal in their nature. Thus the second chapter is on Earnestness, and opens as follows:—

21. Earnestness is the path of immortality (Nirvāna), thoughtlessness the path of death. Those who are in earnest do not die, those who are thoughtless are as if dead already.

23. These wise people, meditative, steady, always possessed of strong powers, attain to Nirvāna, the highest happiness.

24. If an earnest person has roused himself, if he is not forgetful, if his acts are pure, if he acts with consideration, if he restrains himself, and lives according to law, then his glory will increase.

The fourth chapter is on "Flowers," which are brought in to illustrate moral teachings:—

49. As the bee collects nectar and departs without injuring the flower, or its colour or scent, so let a sage dwell in his village.

51. Like a beautiful flower, full of colour and full of scent, are the fine but fruitless words of him who does not act accordingly.

52. But, like a beautiful flower, full of colour and full of scent, are the fine and fruitful words of him who acts accordingly.

In the chapter on "Punishment" men are exhorted to abstain from injuring each other, because others "are like unto them," and alike fear death and love life. And the concluding verses of the chapter inquire:—

143. Is there in this world any man so restrained by humility that he does not mind reproof, as a well-trained horse the whip.

144. Like a well-trained horse when touched by the whip, be ye active and lively, and by faith, by virtue, by energy, by meditation, by discernment of the law you will overcome this great pain (of reproof), perfect in knowledge and in behaviour, and never forgetful.

Professor Müller translates the word Buddha as the "Awakened," and says that it "is to be taken as an appellative rather than as the proper name of the Buddha. It means anybody who has arrived at a complete knowledge." Etymologically this is true; but it is certain that it is almost invariably used for Gotama, the Buddha himself. In support of his assertion Professor Müller appeals to the following verse, which is one of the most solemn of verses among the Buddhists:—

183. Not to commit any sin, to do good, and to purify one's mind, that is the teaching of (all) the Awakened.

We cannot see the necessity for the interpolation here of the word "all." The context does not require it, but it is rather opposed to it, for it calls Buddha "the Omniscient"; and, although Mr. Müller says that the word is applied to "anybody who has arrived at a complete knowledge," it may well be doubted if "complete knowledge" is equivalent to that divine omniscience which Buddhists ascribe to Buddha. This reading is important in another sense, for, if the word Buddha here applies to the great founder of the religion, it becomes tolerably clear that the *Dhammapada* was not his own composition.

The treatise translated by Dr. Fausbøll, and forming the second part of this volume, is like the *Dhammapada* of great antiquity, but its date and its author are in like manner unknown. It is considerably longer than the *Dhammapada*, being divided into five *vaggas* or books, containing 55 chapters and occupying 214 pages. Dr. Fausbøll says:—

The Collection of Discourses *Sutta-nipāta* which I have here translated is very remarkable, as there can be no doubt that it contains some remnants of Primitive Buddhism. I consider the greater part of the *Mahāvagga* [Book III.] and nearly the whole of the *Aththakavagga* [Book V.] as very old. I have arrived at this conclusion from two reasons, first, from the language, and secondly, from the contents.

And he goes on to support his opinion as to the language by citing various words which come nearer to the old Vedic forms than to those of the Sanskrit of later date.

As to the contents of the work he says:—

In the contents of the *Sutta-nipāta* we have, I think, an important contribution to the right understanding of Primitive Buddhism, for we see here a picture, not of life in monasteries, but of the life of hermits in its first stage. We have before us not the systematizing of the later Buddhist Church, but the first germs of a system, the fundamental ideas of which come out with sufficient clearness. From the *Aththakavagga* especially it is evident where Buddha takes his stand in opposition to Philosophy.

In the days of Buddha, as Dr. Fausbøll conclusively proves, India had two large and distinguished religious sects, the Samanas and Brāhmaṇas. The Samanas were of four kinds, and among them there were current at the time of Buddha no less than sixty-three philosophical systems. The same order of things seems to have existed among the Brāhmaṇas, and in condemnation they are

called "friends of the hymns" [of the *Veda*], and that they worship and make offerings to the fire, proving a strong Brahmanical influence over them. Polemical contentions were rife among both classes, and Buddha, grieved and offended at these variances, contended with and overcame the professors of all the sects in succession. He then asserted and enforced his own doctrine that "no one is purified and saved by philosophy or virtuous works, and that sanctification can be attained only by going into the yoke with Buddha, by believing in him and in the *Dhamma* of the Saints," and, in short, by being what Buddha himself is.

Buddha is described in various ways in the *Sutta-nipāta*. "He is Visionary in the good sense of the word" who, finding misery in the philosophical systems, at length discovered inward peace, and enjoined upon all men the duty of immediately embracing the religious life. Secondly, he is an Ascetic, or *Muni*, who forsakes the world and wanders about houseless; he has no prejudices; he has shaken off philosophical views and enters into no disputes; he is neither pleased nor displeased with anything; he is indifferent to learning; he does not cling to good and evil, and has cut off all passion and all desire, being equal and unmoved under all circumstances. He is still and calm as deep water, and has reached peace; knowing that bliss consists in peace, he has gone to immortal peace, the unchangeable state of *Nirvāna*. All this he effected by the destruction of consciousness, which is brought about by the cessation of sensation and by being without breathing. According to the teaching of this book, Sin, subjectively, is "Desire in all its various forms," but more especially for individual existence, which is the cause of birth and death, the two great evils from which escape is to be sought. On the other hand, bliss is subjectively emancipation from desire by means of the peace that Buddha preaches; and objectively it is emancipation from body and matter, by which the body is left behind, so that it may not exist again. "As a flame, blown about by the violence of the wind, goes out, and cannot be reckoned (as existing), even so a *Muni*, delivered from name and body, disappears, and cannot be reckoned (as existing). For him who has disappeared, there is no form; that by which they say he is, exists for him no longer." Such is a brief summary of the teachings of the *Sutta-nipāta*. Its style and method may be judged by quoting the first verse of the *Uraga-sutta*, or Serpent chapter, from its drawing a general illustration from the snake's slough. "He who restrains his anger when it has arisen, as (they) by medicines (restrain) the poison of the snake spreading (in the body), that *Bhikkhu* (mendicant) leaves this and the further shore, as a snake (quits its) old worn-out skin."

A few words more on the vexed question of spelling. Professor Müller has hitherto strongly insisted that the Sanskrit originals of Pāli Buddhist terms should be used in English writings whenever it is necessary to employ, and not translate them. But Pāli scholars have carried the day against him. Some of the original Sanskrit terms have received such various alterations of form in the different countries over which Buddhism has spread that their identity is far from obvious. No superficial scholar, for instance, would recognize the Sanskrit *darsanam* in the Pāli *dīti*. To translate such words "back into Sanskrit might seem as affected, nay prove in certain cases as misleading, as if in speaking of priests and kings we were to speak of presbyters and cynings." Mr. Müller thus gracefully gives up the contention, but declares his intention of using the Sanskrit forms when he has to speak or write of Buddhism in general. This seems to be the right, as it certainly is a convenient, method; for many readers would, for instance, understand *Nirvāna* to whom *Nibbāna* would be puzzling; and there are very many other words of the same nature. It would be advantageous to readers, but perhaps too much to ask of authors of books like the present, that they should supply in brackets the original Sanskrit word whenever the Pāli term has so varied from its old Sanskrit form as to make its identification difficult.

#### ON LATMOS.\*

THIS is a novel of the decidedly sensational order, for which that class of work, however, even the apparently overstocked market does not seem to have diminished the demand. Miss Aiken-Kortright has written several other books of the same style, and apparently there is still a sale for her productions. Idle people are many, and idle people love a volume printed in large type, with few pages and a spirited plot. We cannot say that we have found the plot really exciting ourselves; but it certainly pretends to that distinction, and it may serve as interesting between those hours of the afternoon when tea and visitors have departed and the dressing-bell has not yet rung. Horatia Ormsby has "wandered upon Latmos heights," and "tasted love and known despair"; let us hope that some of the readers of her story may also climb the steep sides of illusion and fancy—though not, it is to be hoped, to "know despair." Horatia Ormsby is the beautiful and sole heiress to "the decayed manor-house, unshaven lawns, and sterile lands," also to the "accumulated debts and mortgages," of Ormsby Manor. She is an imposing young woman, and, had she worn the coronet of a duchess for years, she could not have moved with a more majestic air, under the stately cedars; but she is not at all of an engaging or lovable nature, and

even suggests some doubts as to her good breeding by her rude manners to her friends and neighbours, and her excessive scorn of any but quite the pattern poor on her father's estate. So intolerant is this haughty damsel of every kind of vice that, although she frequently helped the sick and poor from her own slender purse, she never did so save when they were eminently respectable, while "to the man who had ever yielded, even temporarily, to the vice of intemperance, or to the frail woman who could not have served at Vesta's altar, she was severely just." So just, indeed, is she that she is not ashamed to turn the old lodge-keeper from the home of years for a single extra pint at Christmas, or to banish a young dependent, with a baby, to squalor and sin in a distant town, rather than give her out work from the Manor to keep her in honesty. Every reader of this tale will, we think, feel a certain kind of satisfaction when this proud and ruthless heiress of the calm temper herself falls a prey to the tyrant passion, and is forced, most justly, to submit in agonized silence to the taunts of the very woman whom she has condemned. For it must be said at once that this novel is not precisely of the homely and simple type of literature which the proverbial English mother is supposed to place without a misgiving in the hands of her innocent daughters. If not in strength and conciseness of plot, or in pithiness and brilliancy of dialogue, it has at least in the elements of sensationalism taken its cue from the typical French novel, and would, we fancy, fair rank with the publicly denounced and privately devoured works of fiction supposed to make up the stock of a foreign library. But somehow an improbable love intrigue, however forbidden be the fruit, an attempted description of *demi-monde* life, and even a good daring murder, do not suffice to produce a baneful book unless something of realistic force and individual passion be added thereto, and we would defy the most excitable novel-reading young miss, on the warmest and laziest summer's day, to derive the smallest possible amount of harm from the perusal of the experiences of Miss Horatia Ormsby. The intricate little tale is, however, full of complications. To save the ancestral domain from ruin and degradation, Horatia is, at the opening of the story, supposed to be about to listen to her incompetent old father's earnest persuasions, and bestow her hand upon a proud peer of the name of Lord Selmore. But, on its appearing—in an interview described with not the most perfect refinement—that the cold-featured lord has not really had any intention of bidding for the hand of Miss Ormsby until he guesses the old squire's wish by his too evident desire to open transactions, the young lady herself flouts the whole affair by asking her suitor if he mistakes her for a steed at Tattersall's, and sweeps out of the room with a good deal of dignity. This leaves the stage free for the entrance of Luigi Valerio, the beautiful, but illegitimate, son of an Englishman by an Italian peasant girl. This young gentleman comes to the village in the capacity of organist, and soon touches the heart of the heroine with his wonderful performances in the parish church, while at the same time he involuntarily engages the affections of Ellen Grantley, the *ingénue* of the book, during the course of twilight music lessons. Valerio himself is a good-natured fool, but he pays dearly for being possessed of such statuesque beauty and musical talent. Miss Ormsby marks him for her own. She soon disposes of poor Ellen—her friend and *protégée*—brutally scoffs at her foolish passion, and packs her off to London, where she quickly persuades the worsted Selmore into proposing to her in a misplaced fit of generosity by hinting that the girl's slighted passion was for himself. Nothing then remains but to ensnare Valerio, and a very few music lessons compass this end. What follows is really ingenious. Such girl could not compromise herself by openly affecting a sentiment for one so far beneath her; but the old Manor has in a distant wing a suite of haunted rooms, and thither the apartments of the young lady are speedily removed; so that she is not only able to receive Valerio at tête-à-tête midnight interviews, but also, in case of accidents, to pass him off as the ancestral ghost of the ancient family history. This happy state of things does not, however, last long. Having surrendered her honour, but without intending to "plunge deeper into folly" by marrying the lowly object of her passion, Miss Ormsby wearsies of music, and determines to put her lover's constancy to the proof by tasting the delights of a London season while he pines alone in the solitude of a country village. She gets more than she bargained for. One day, driving in the Row, a lady of the *demi-monde* is pointed out to her, and she sees with consternation her own Valerio exchanging cards at the Park railings with this dashing personage. True, he soon shifts his attention to gaze admiringly after herself, but he does not recognize her. Here is plainly a mystery, for we are presently introduced to the questionable damsel entertaining her admirers—among them the enigmatical Italian—at her house in Park Lane, and the supposed deceiver lectures Miss Lotty in a fashion inconsistent with a love intrigue, even drawing tears from her eyes for a moment. A mystery is not a new thing; but the visit of a lady of rank to a person of doubtful virtue, and her abject petition for secrecy, purchased with a diamond ring, are rather startling in their novelty. We ought to compliment Miss Aiken-Kortright upon her success in these days when the competition for new things is so severe. For there is no partiality shown to the great in this interview. As Miss Lotty kindly reminds her aristocratic visitor, they are both in the same boat, and poor Horatia leaves the house in Park Lane not only degraded but deceived. Her deception costs the Greek-headed music-master his life. The heiress returns to the haunted rooms in the old

Manor, and, refusing to believe her lover's oath that he has never left the village, poisons him in a cup of wine. Fortunately she gets him out of the house before the drug takes effect, and he dies playing the organ, the strains of which are wafted to her upon the midnight breeze. A marriage with the proud peer so rudely spurned in the first chapters follows as a matter of course, since the *ingénue* has refused to be sold to him on the very morning of her wedding day; and no less inevitable is the reappearance of the facsimile Valerio—Luigi's twin brother—in whom the reader will recognize Miss Lotty's midnight mentor. This highly virtuous gentleman, bent on revenge, haunts the path of Horatia, Lady Selmore, in the manner of the Corsican twin. The lady of course is much discomposed by this apparition, but tries to hope that her drug did not actually kill the victim; anyhow, her fears and faintings finally arouse the suspicions of the upright husband, who, on being convinced of his wife's past dis-honour, nobly expires of a broken heart with the portrait and the letters of his dead rival in his hand. It now only remains for the twin to disclose his identity to the tragic widow, and threaten to abandon her to justice unless she consents to turn the old Manor house into a home for fallen women. This she speedily proceeds to do, for she is overwhelmed with remorse that her crime was committed on an innocent man, and she even turns the wicked Lotty to contrition for a short, a very short, time. Not even the avenging brother's kind order of release, given in the sunshine of his own wedded morn, can break the proud spirit of Lady Selmore, who will not be beholden to any one, and prefers to await what she is pleased to call the miracle of her granite nature's repentance, near her victim's grave, rather than in the liberty of a foreign land. The tale closes on her in a high-necked gown and an unbecoming bonnet. The only relief to this gloomy recital is the love of the music-master's priggish brother for a homely English maiden, who does more than a mother's duty to her orphan brothers and sisters, though her dress is always "dowdy in the extreme." The portrait of this young lady, who rejoices in the name of Ithama, is a pretty sketch; but she can hold but a small place in a tale treating of so many and such varied types of character in so small a space. Miss Aiken-Kortright certainly has a talent for weaving a plot, although she does it somewhat in defiance of the probabilities of life; but the book belongs to a category which, if it has a large circulation among the general public, can scarcely hold a high place in the world of literature.

#### PUBLICATIONS OF THE ENGLISH DIALECT SOCIETY.\*

THE second part of the *Dictionary of English Plant Names* carries the compilers over the main portion of their task. The forthcoming part will complete a work which will preserve not a few words that are rapidly dying out. The changes which railways have brought with them are making havoc of the old talk of the people in the remotest parts of the country; and the usefulness of the English Dialect Society may be measured not many years hence by the memorials which they will have handed down of dialects in places where those dialects will be no longer known. The purpose of the editor is to assign to the popular names of plants their scientific equivalents rather than to go into much detail about the plants themselves; but some of the entries convey information which may have some interest for those who know little and care little for botany. Among the most curious of these entries is one on "Mother's Heart." At first sight there is nothing to attract us in the seemingly stupid game played with the seed pouch of the *Capsella bursa-pastoris* in the Eastern border district, where the children hold out the pouch to their companions asking them "to take a hand o' that." It immediately cracks, and then follows the shout, "You've broken your mother's heart." But our attention is roused when we learn that in Hanover, as well as in the Swiss canton of St. Gall, the same plant is offered to any one who will pluck off one of the pods, the comment on the act of plucking being, "You have stolen a purse of gold from your father and mother," and, secondly, that the game is found in a slightly different form in Venezuela, where the plant used is the common tropical weed *Ageratum conyzoides*, known popularly as "Romper anguel." This name, according to Dr. Gorst, is explained by some as "rompes á tu abuelo" (you tear your grandfather), this being the exclamation when, of two children who take hold of the leaf, one by the lower, the other by the upper part, either of them pulls so hard as to tear the leaf. Are these two forms of the game in countries so distant to be traced to a common source, or is it after all only a case of borrowing or learning by one people from another? The question is one which can scarcely be settled without running on into a wider subject.

The general and inveterate habit of corrupting names is, as we might expect, abundantly illustrated in this Dictionary. *Langde-beef*, the popular name of the herb bugloss, is the *Langue de bœuf* of Central France, where, however, it designates not the same, but an allied plant. In Hertfordshire the name loses its meaning in its corrupted form *Langley Beef*. But in Kems, the popular name for *Plantago lanceolata*, a genuine English word for warriors has been preserved, although it has died out of the written language. The ballad of "King Estmere" in Percy's *Reliques* speaks of the

King of Spayne as coming forth "with Kempis many one"; and the plants are still used by children in Scotland in the common game of beheading warriors—that is, of decapitating the head of a plant by means of another held in the opponent's hand. In "neesewort," or "neesing root," the name of *Veratrum album*, as making people sneeze, we have an intermediate form between *Naze* (Ness), and *Nose*. The Jerusalem artichoke has its place in the Dictionary; but nothing is said of the origin of the word, and the reader is left to learn elsewhere that it is an instance of corruption much more singular than that which converted "langue de bœuf" into *Langley Beef*. The list of plants whose names are compounded with the word *horse* is, of course, a long one; but here too it might have been pointed out that the first part of the name is used in different senses. The *Horsebane* is necessarily that which kills the horse; but the horse does not eat all the plants which bear his name. The *Horsetail* and the *Horsetongue* are so called from a supposed likeness to the tail and the tongue of the horse; but the *Horse-thistle*, the *Horse-sorrel*, and many more are, we can scarcely doubt, so named by the same process which gave the Greeks a *Bou-pais* or a *Boukephalos*. The *Horse-plum*, however, known also as the *Horse-jug*, *Horse-jags*, is said to be a small red plum, although the *Horse-gogs* denote a large wild plum yellow in colour and late in ripening. But, in truth, the popular names of plants generally are to be interpreted cariously. Some which have an ancient look are quite modern, as *Timothy Grass*, which bears the name of Mr. Timothy Hanson, who brought the seeds of it to Carolina; others are old Teutonic words, sometimes oddly misunderstood, as the *holly*, which Mr. Skeat traces to a root reappearing in the Latin *culmen* and *culmus*, but which Theis, in his *Botanical Glossary*, explains in the following wonderful fashion:—"Holly, saint, sacred; à cause de sa verdure perpétuelle, regardée comme un don de ciel."

Mr. Britten's volume on *Old Country and Farming Words* may be regarded as supplementary to his *Dictionary of Plant Names*. While at work for the latter, he was led to consult Ellis's *Modern Husbandman* as a possible storehouse of plant names. In this search he came across many other words which seemed unusual, and which Ellis stated to be of local use. The collection of these words suggested the overhauling of some other agricultural works of the last century; and the result is the present volume, which is enriched by many valuable comments from Mr. Skeat. There is little doubt that Mr. Skeat's favourable opinion will be borne out by those who may take up the book, although the list of entries is by no means confined to unusual words. The use of *bavin* in the sense of "a bundle of brushwood" is not peculiar to the county in which Ellis lived. We have the *hazel bavin*, as furnishing a seat, mentioned in *Hudibras*. The peculiarity would be rather in the modern usage of builders, who denote by it thin lathes, not rough wood. But, on the whole, the several lists given in this volume show that the books from which they have been drawn up were well worth the trouble taken in examining them. These works are the *Modern Husbandman*, and other writings of William Ellis; the *Observations on Husbandry*, by Edward Lisle; the *Dictionary of Rusticorum* of J. Worlidge; the *Annals of Agriculture*, compiled by the well-known Arthur Young, and the *Reports of the Agricultural Survey*. Mr. Britten gives a further list of Agricultural Provincialisms and of Weights and Measures from Morton's *Cyclopaedia of Agriculture*. Ellis, whose works are taken first in order, was a most prolific writer; in plain English, he wrote a great deal too much. His *Husbandry* passed through five editions; but both this work and his other writings seem to have been utterly forgotten. The fact is perhaps explained by the opinion of the writer of the short memoir prefixed to the abridged edition of 1772, that Ellis "engaged for larger quantities of MS. than his materials of real excellence would allow," and that thus "all his pieces are nearly equal in being filled with trash," the consequence being that "he no longer found any pecuniary advantage in writing." He showed his sound sense by giving up his scribbling and sticking to his farm, with the determination of depending upon it alone. It would seem that, even in the padding of his books, he had an eye to the main chance. He "made a tracick of ploughs, horsebreaks, &c. &c." and this "induced him to be very voluminous in their description and very hyperbolical in their praise." In short, his books were advertisements. Of his personal life little is known; but he lived for half a century at Little Gadsden, in Hertfordshire, where probably he was born. Edward Lisle was a landowner in Wiltshire and the Isle of Wight, but towards the end of the seventeenth century he settled himself at Crux Easton, in Hampshire, and there carried on with enthusiastic zeal the work of farming, to which he devoted his life. "His constant method," his son tells us, "was to note down the opinions and advices he thought might be useful to him, and afterwards to add occasional remarks on them from his own experience." But he formed no plans of publishing the results of his research for many years later; and his *Observations on Husbandry* were not given to the world till after his death in 1722. Of John Worlidge or Woodbridge little more is known than that he lived at Petersfield in Hampshire; that he wrote several treatises on agriculture, bees, and gardening; and that he took a scientific view of farming, which placed him beyond his contemporaries. His chief work, the *Systema Agriculture*, was published in 1669. Arthur Young, the compiler and publisher of the *Annals of Agriculture*, needs no notice; but his name failed to win much success for the ponderous volumes, forty-six in number, of which this series consists. Mr. Britten adds that the number of words

\* *A Dictionary of English Plant Names*. By James Britten, F.L.S., and Robert Holland. Part II.

*Old Country and Farming Words*. By James Britten, F.L.S. London: Published for the English Dialect Society, Trübner & Co. 1880.

tained from them scarcely compensates the toil of the research, although there are among them some of interest. From them we learn that the old *fang*, to take, survives in the phrase *vang in*, which denotes the taking in of stock in contrast with breeding it. From Worlidge we have the words *neaving* and *nope*, in both of which Mr. Skeat asserts that the same process of coalition between the final consonant of the preceding word and the initial vowel of the word itself has taken place, *neaving*, yeast or barm, being the result produced from "an *heaving*," and *nope*, denoting "bulphinch," being obtained from "an *alp*." Close to these words we have the entry *neat*, of which the only explanation given is that it means "a heifer, or any of the kind of beees." To those who are not aware of it, it might be interesting to know that *neat* is a compound word, answering exactly to the Greek *Alogon*, although the latter is confined to horses and the former to cattle.

Here and there an explanation seems to throw little light on the matter explained. In Hertfordshire we are told that "declining husbandmen" are called "afternoon farmers"; and under *de-clining* we read that the word means *backward*. It would seem, then, that farmers who are behindhand with their work are looked upon as men who spend their mornings in sleep and get up after midday; but it is not so easy to see why such men should be called declining, unless indeed it be because the sun is going down when they are getting up. Leaving this obscure question, we may notice that the Hertfordshire form for *fitches* or *vetches* is *thetches*. This Mr. Skeat rightly considers important, "as showing *th=ph* and corroborating *full-horse=thill-horse*." In the word *beaves* as used among the English peasantry we have a form intermediate between the Latin *bibere* and the French *boire*. Of this there can be no doubt, although the accounts given of the meal so called refer only to the solid and not to the liquid food consumed. By Hertfordshire usage it seems to have been an afternoon meal of bread and cheese; but in Essex it was, we are told, the first meal taken by horsekeepers after beginning work. The entry *beavis* might lead us to expect a word of equal interest; but it is scarcely so. Lisle speaks of a friend as telling him that "a cow-calf would make very pretty beef at three years old, but, if killed sooner, they called it *beavis*." This Mr. Skeat interprets as "probably *beef-ish*—i.e. beeflike—not quite beef, but like it." Some country expressions give variant forms of French words. Thus *suant*, which has been referred to the French *suivant*, is the old French *suant*, which occurs in the English *pursuant*. The Middle English of *Piers Plowman* has *sewyng*. In *Stafford* we have, Mr. Skeat thinks, only a rustic mistake for *Scaffold*, "a fine English word of French origin. The rustic naturally substituted the *st* of his familiar *staddle* or *staddle*, as in *bedstead, bedstaddle*." *Hellrakes*, which for some mysterious reason are said to be so called from the great quantity of work which they get through in a short time, Mr. Skeat regards as a product of false etymology, the word occurring as *hellrake* (*heelerake*). Of the verb *team*, which is, we are told, in the North of England, "to unload carts," a team being an empty cart (Scottish *toom*, empty), Mr. Skeat's comment is, "Some mistake; we all know a *team* is not an empty cart. The word *team*, better *team*, to empty, is formed from *toom* by vowel change, like *feed*, verb, from *food*, *sb.*, or *meet*, verb, from *moot*, *sb.*, an assembly. A *team* is quite a different matter."

The reader who consults these lists may be tempted to regret that Mr. Skeat's comments and suggestions are not more numerous. But Mr. Britten urges with justice that the purpose of the English Dialect Society is rather to collect than to elaborate, and that he has regarded his own task as sufficiently done when he had compared the words in his authorities with Halliwell and such other works as happened to be under his hand at the time, adding references where these seemed to be desirable. The value of his work will be more fully seen some years hence.

#### FRENCH LITERATURE.

THE Letters of Mme. de Rémusat (1) may suffer a little from comparison with the brilliant and historically important memoirs which preceded them. But their want of interest is only comparative. Written as they were for the most part to her husband during his enforced absences with the Emperor, much of them is taken up with matters extremely interesting to the writer, but of perhaps less lively attraction to the readers for whom they were not intended. About public affairs there is not much, and indeed, under Napoleon's Government, it was by no means safe to write freely on any such subject. Some private friends who are of interest, such as Morellet, Mme. d'Houdetot, Talleyrand, appear once more, and there are occasionally amusing details as to Mme. de Rémusat's troubles with the actors. In his capacity of Chamberlain, M. de Rémusat was responsible for the supervision and management of His Majesty's servants, and this responsibility continued even when he was absent. His deputies were not over efficient, and Mme. de Rémusat constantly had to pacify offended genius by feminine arts. Perhaps, however, the most really interesting thing in the book is its display of the affectionate, vivacious, acute, but somewhat hasty, nature of the writer. Mme. de Rémusat never cooled in her affection for her husband, and theoretically acquiesced in the doctrine in which husbands find it hard to make wives believe—that in absence business makes correspondence difficult. Every now and then there are

the oddest little outbursts of wounded feeling, because a letter has not come or has been cold in style, outbursts which are almost invariably followed by penitential apologies. Altogether, the book, if it does not add very much to actual historical knowledge, adds agreeably to the literature of biography.

M. Beljame's book (2) is one which, but a short time ago, would, as coming from a Frenchman, have been greeted as something of a prodigy. The only characteristically Gallic trait is that the author, instead of writing (as he is obviously well qualified to do) a history of English literature from Dryden to Pope, has written, nominally at least, an essay on the relations of the public to men of letters, illustrated by the lives and works of Dryden, Pope, and Addison. The book shows a most remarkable acquaintance not merely with the great authors of the period, but with the whole range of lighter English literature at the time. M. Beljame's apparatus of footnotes, citations, bibliographical tables, &c., is very extensive, and he is singularly accurate. No one, indeed, save those who have had occasion to make a minute examination of the same subjects can fairly appreciate his erudition, which in a foreigner is most remarkable, or his critical faculty, which, where he exercises it independently, is worthy of not less attention. After all that has been written about Collier's onslaught on the theatre M. Beljame is well worth reading upon it, and he has displayed more impartiality than any of his English predecessors. Where he is weakest, and where he might be expected to be weakest, is in what may be called secondhand criticism—that is to say, in accepting and valuing the opinions and statements of different English critics and historians. But his work is for the most part so thoroughly verified by reference to the originals that this is of but little importance.

A good study of Dupleix has long been wanted, and M. Tibulle Hamont (3) goes far to supply that want. He seems to have been put on the track by Colonel Malleson. But he has given himself a great deal of trouble to discover and search the unprinted correspondence of his hero, and the result is a piece of work sufficiently solid and decidedly interesting. That M. Hamont should be somewhat disposed to overvalue Dupleix is natural. To say that the English conquest and administration of India proceeded on lines which were a "servile copy" of those of Dupleix is rather more than pardonable extravagance. However, the treatment in the text is a good deal more sober than might be expected from this little firework in the preface. The remarkable capacity of Dupleix has never been denied, nor is it deniable that he was very badly seconded by his military lieutenants and treated by the home Government very nearly as Hannibal was treated by the Carthaginian Senate. Considering, however, how entirely the odds were in his favour for a long time, and how completely he lost the game, it is pretty obvious that there must have been some deficiency in his play. His generals were far inferior to Clive and Lawrence (to whose genius, especially that of the latter, M. Hamont does full justice); but perhaps some readers of this book will be of opinion that the suggestions, encouragements, reassurances, &c., of which Dupleix was so prodigal to them were likely to do more harm than good. It is also clear from this book that, selfish and inhuman as our Government in India too often was in its early days, that of the French was conducted on far worse principles. The breaking of the dikes of the Cauvery, "afin de frapper l'imagination des Indians et de leur montrer que comme un Dieu il dispose des éléments pour frapper ses ennemis," is one of the blackest acts even in French history. M. Hamont, we think, is unfair to La Bourdonnais. However, these are controversial matters. If M. Hamont's book brings out Dupleix's faults, it also brings out fully, and almost for the first time, his abilities, and duly exposes the ingratitude with which he was treated. Even here, perhaps, the Devil's advocate may have something to say; for, after all, Dupleix had played double or quits with the French possessions in India, and had lost.

The principal characteristic of M. Benlow's essay on the philosophy of history (4) may be said to be the freedom and independence of his generalizations. All history is divided into the cycle of the ideal of beauty (Greece, &c.), the cycle of the ideal of goodness (Christian period up to the Renaissance), the cycle of the ideal of truth (modern times). The neatest tabular demonstrations, the most agreeable corroborating disquisitions, accompany the unfolding of this attractive sketch. There is really a good deal of learning and some ingenuity in *Les lois de l'histoire*, but it is to be hoped that no one will read it who is not already well acquainted with the facts.

*La Papauté au moyen-âge* (5) is an essay of a much more solid kind, consisting of four studies on Nicholas I., Gregory VII., Innocent III., and Boniface VIII. It is perhaps one of those books which are rather creditable to the writer than profitable to the reader, yet to the intelligent reader it is likely to be not wholly destitute of profit.

M. Perroud's monograph (6) is of a different, and as we venture to think a much superior, kind to both of these. It is a definite attempt to settle a definite point which requires settling—in this case the date and circumstances of the constitution

(1) *Lettres de Mme. de Rémusat*. 2 vols. Paris: Calmann-Lévy.

(2) *Le public et les hommes de lettres en Angleterre (1660-1744)*. Par A. Beljame. Paris: Hachette et Cie.

(3) *Dupleix*. Par Tibulle Hamont. Paris: Plon.

(4) *Les lois de l'histoire*. Par L. Benlow. Paris: Germer-Bailliére.

(5) *La Papauté au moyen-âge*. Par F. Rocquain. Paris: Didier.

(6) *Les origines de l'Aquitaine*. Par Cl. Perroud. Paris: Hachette et Cie.

of the first independent duchy of Aquitaine. The problem is a curious one, and the facts available are but few. M. Perroud, however, makes the most of them, and fills up the gaps, not with mere theorizing, but with inference, which is on the whole probable and legitimate enough.

The sixth volume of the *Grands-écrivains* edition of Molière (7), which is now in the hands of M. Paul Mesnard, contains *Le Médecin malgré lui*, *Mélicerte*, the *Pastorale Comique*, *Le Sicilien*, *Amphytrion*, and *Georges Dandin*. The notices and other critical apparatus are as solid and complete as usual.

The *Bibliothèque utile* has been increased by two useful little treatises (8), one on the *Anthropoid apes*, the other on newspapers. The title *Le Journal* would be a little more correctly written *Le Journal Français*, but this is natural enough, and M. Hatin has not been altogether exclusive in his treatment.

Criticisms on exhibitions have, after the exhibition is over, always something of the flavour of an old almanac. M. Maurice du Seigneur's "salon" (9) is, however, a good one, and it has for preface a really interesting sketch of the chief works in this curious department of literature in France in times past.

Mme. Clémence Royer (10) is, we fear, hardly to be called a "philosopher" of the highest class. Her book on ethics contains, so far as we have been able to discover, little but commonplaces clothed in the quasi-scientific jargon which is nowhere more repulsive than in French. The language of Condillac and Malebranche surely is not in need of the clumsy neologisms of a certain school of modern thought. Perhaps it should be mentioned that Mme. Clémence Royer is by her own account an anticipator of Mr. Herbert Spencer (*non émule*, she calls him), one of the anticipators who by evil fortune cannot get their works out first.

M. Lockroy has thought to serve his political party by printing (11) some journals of a Jacobin ancestry of his written during the Revolution. He seems to think that this journal will help to whitewash a "parti odieusement et systématiquement calomnié." The result of reading it is, that we find a mother writing to her son (a boy of fourteen) "Nos courageux représentants après avoir bravé les foudres du despotisme," and much other windy rubbish of the same kind, and describing the unspeakable September massacres as "a miraculous salvation of Providence." To do Mme. —— justice, she seems to have had some qualms about the means which Providence chose; but, as she philosophically remarks or quotes, "Quand on veut la fin, il faut vouloir les moyens."

*Les ports de la Grande-Bretagne* (12) is a very careful sketch of Glasgow, Newcastle, Liverpool, and London, in separate articles, and of the remaining ports of England and Scotland grouped together. These capital papers, of considerable literary merit, and full of facts not always known to Englishmen themselves, are reprinted from the *Nouvelle Revue*.

A slight, but readable, account of a journey through Spain to Algeria (13) adds one more to the long list of recent books by Frenchmen on their North African colony.

M. Emile Zola reprints his criticisms with energy and perseverance. This volume (14) contains articles on Balzac, Stendhal, Flaubert, the two De Goncourts, and M. A. Daudet, besides the general article on "Les romanciers contemporains" which not long ago provoked so many of his *confrères*. We need not repeat the opinion we have often expressed of M. Zola's criticism. With occasional vigorous and acute *aperçus*, it is, on the whole, tedious, destitute of appreciation, and wearisomely subordinated to the general purpose of proving that all good novelists were but schoolmasters to lead men to Zolaism. Its impertinent personalities are probably more annoying to the victims than they are amusing to the reader. There is, however, one paper, consisting of elaborate personal reminiscences of Flaubert, which is of the highest interest. It shows (what no capable critic acquainted with the works of the author has ever doubted) that Flaubert was nothing so little as naturalist. His standards, his methods, his models were all romantic; and to this, beyond all question, is due the excellence of his work.

We must notice the 89th livraison (15) of the *Dictionnaire de pédagogie* in order to point out a most admirable short article on Shakspeare by M. Paul Stapfer, whose more extended Shakspearian work, as well as his essays on other subjects, have more than once been noticed in these columns. The article in question is so good a summary of the subject in a small space that we should be rather puzzled to find its equal, all things considered, in English.

Some pleasant verse comedies and verses, intended for recitation, have been published (16) by M. Pailleron in M. Calmann-Lévy's

pretty *format* of square 16mo. Perhaps the best thing in the book is the vigorous anti-naturalist preface eulogizing the old standards, the old masters, the old tongue:—

Qui ne suffit pas à Ricouard  
Et suffisait à La Bruyère.

M. Sarcey's notice of Mlle. Rousseil (17), which is illustrated by an *eau-forte* by M. Lalanne, is as amusing in its way and as full of vulgarity and bad taste as M. Sarcey's notices of this kind are too apt to be. It opens with a pleasingly characteristic sentence:— "C'était en 1861, il y a donc vingt ans dès cela; je venais de débuter dans la critique dramatique. Je n'étais pas encore bien connu; mais pour les élèves qui sortent du Conservatoire tout homme qui met son nom au bas d'un papier noir ci est un personnage."

The last volume (18) of the Library Edition of the works of the late Joseph Autran contains the posthumous and, we believe, hitherto unpublished *Comédie de l'histoire*. It is a curiously unconscious testimony to the triumphant influence of M. Victor Hugo. Autran was never regarded as in any way a Hugoian; on the contrary, he was a decided Lamartinet. Yet not merely the title, but the plan and style, of this book are almost copies of the *Légende des siècles*. We cannot say that the result is very happy. Autran was a poet in his way, and what there was of limp in his versification has been corrected by the study of his great brother Academician. But the style of most of these pieces does not suit him, and he neglects the first duty of the satirist, the duty of being accurate. "Le Médailon," for instance, gives the famous incident of Voltaire's asking for a locket from Mme. du Châtelet's neck after her death and finding his own portrait replaced by St. Lambert's. This little piece swarms with blunders. It is absurd to say that Voltaire "dominait le siècle," at this time. St. Lambert had not "translated Thompson in bad verse," nor did the *Saisons* appear for nearly twenty years after. Voltaire certainly did not say, "J'ai besoin d'achever mon acte de Tancrède," inasmuch as *Tancrède* was not then thought of. This is not the way that great satirists go to work.

The republication of M. Victor de Laprade's *Poèmes évangéliques* (19) may excite a taste for sacred poetry in France, but with all respect for his classic style and really admirable attention to form, we venture to doubt it.

M. Paul Déroulède's *Marches et sonneries* (20) have come from France with a great rumour of popularity. The reading of them is rather disappointing. Their success can only be attributed to the fit of what some Englishmen are pleased to call in other Englishmen jingoism which now has hold on France. We hardly think that M. Déroulède is the Rouget de Lisle of the Third Republic. There is a generous fervour, indeed, about him, and he occasionally hits off a vigorous line. But, on the whole, his book is more declamatory and more often actually prosaic than we could have expected from the author of *La Moabite*.

France has some admirable writers of children's books, from the venerable M. Sandau downwards, and among these M. P. J. Stahl has a prominent place. *Les quatre peurs de notre général* (21), stories told by an Algerian commander to his staff over the camp-fire, are very pleasant moral tales, with the moral wrapped up in the very deftest fashion. We like the first two the best. In one of them a little child forces himself to readjust over a dead man's face the cloth which he has unwittingly disturbed, and in the other he overcomes his fear of cold water. Both are charmingly told. The third is improbable, and a little "goody"; the fourth somewhat out of keeping. But these faults are only comparative, and there are pleasant things in both stories. If we remember rightly, in her last book Mme. Henry Gréville busied herself in showing the sordid parsimony and hardness of heart of the French peasant. She has now (22) devoted herself to studying the corresponding virtues of the French bourgeois, so that her country ought to be very much obliged to her. Adeline Pichot, a young woman of great beauty and angelic appearance, is perhaps as disagreeable a heroine as can well be imagined. Unfortunately, there is a lack of the power which is needed in treating such subjects. Adeline is a heroine of Balzac's treated in the manner of M. Octave Feuillet. This, in Biblical language, is confusion.

In *La bataille de Laon* (23) M. Alfred Assollant exposes himself, as far as subject goes, to the charge of poaching on the manors of MM. Erckmann-Chatrian. There is, however, room for plenty of writers in the last wars of the Empire. M. Assollant writes with less knowledge of the ground and the people than his predecessors, and perhaps with less narrative skill, but with a far stronger and more nervous style. It is only a pity that his book is written in a spirit which makes it one long attack on Germany and the Germans. It cannot be said that this is irrelevant to the subject; but it suggests, and is clearly meant to suggest, as bad a compliment to the companions and contemporaries of Moltke as to the companions and contemporaries of Blucher. M. Albéric

(7) *Œuvres de Molière*. Par P. Mesnard. Tome vi. Paris: Hachette et Cie.

(8) *Bibliothèque utile*.—*Les grands singes*. Par Zaborowski. *Le Journal*. Par E. Hatin. Paris: Germer-Bailliére.

(9) *L'art et les artistes au salon de 1881*. Par Maurice du Seigneur. Paris: Ollendorff.

(10) *Le bien et la loi morale*. Par Clémence Royer. Paris: Guillaumin.

(11) *Journal d'une bourgeoisie pendant la révolution*. Par E. Lockroy. Paris: Calmann-Lévy.

(12) *Les ports de la Grande-Bretagne*. Par L. Simonin. Paris: Hachette & Cie.

(13) *En Algérie*. Par Verne d'Arlandes. Paris: Calmann-Lévy.

(14) *Les Romanciers naturalistes*. Par Emile Zola. Paris: Charletier.

(15) *Dictionnaire de pédagogie*. 89<sup>e</sup> livraison. Paris: Hachette & Cie.

(16) *Le théâtre chez Madame*. Par E. Pailleron. Paris: Calmann-Lévy.

(17) *Deuxième Série de Comédiens et de Comédiennes. Notices biographiques* par F. Sarcey. 9<sup>e</sup> livraison: Rosalie Rousseil. Paris: Librairie des Bibliophiles.

(18) *Œuvres de J. Autran*. Tome viii. Paris: Calmann-Lévy.

(19) *Poèmes évangéliques*. Par V. de Laprade. Paris: Lemerre.

(20) *Marches et sonneries*. Par Paul Déroulède. Paris: Calmann-Lévy.

(21) *Les quatre peurs de notre général*. Par P. J. Stahl. Paris: Hetzel.

(22) *Les degrés de l'échelle*. Par H. Gréville. Paris: Plon.

(23) *La bataille de Laon*. Par A. Assollant. Paris: Plon.

Second's *La vie facile* (24) is a lively enough description of what has been described often enough before, the life of the more frivolous and unworthy part of French society. It is readable, the characters are well drawn, and there is nothing preposterous or revolting about it. *L'Odyssee d'une comédienne* (25) is a book which takes us back many years to the "cape and sword" novel of our youth. It is not at all a bad specimen of its kind, a kind that might be revived with advantage. The scene is laid at Darmstadt at the beginning of the last century. Lastly, has to be mentioned a collection of tales (26) of various merit. As, however, MM. A. Daudet, Theuriet, Malot, besides other well-known names, are on the list of contributors, it is not surprising that it should contain some capital pieces.

(24) *La vie facile* Par A. Second. Paris: Dentu.

(25) *L'Odyssee d'une comédienne*. Par A. Lepage. Paris: Charpentier.

(26) *Chacun la sienne*. Paris: Dentu.

## NOTICE.

We beg leave to state that we decline to return rejected Communications; and to this rule we can make no exception.

THE SATURDAY REVIEW  
OF  
POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

Price 6d.

## CONTENTS OF No. 1,345, AUGUST 6, 1881:

Afghanistan.

England and America. The Land Bill. European Combinations. Egypt. Lord Sherbrooke on Bankruptcy Law. The Transvaal. Competitive Examinations. The French Elections. The Liverpool Fenians.

Cosmic Emotion.

Northampton's Pride. Dr. Plumptre on Modern Scepticism. Steam-Yacht Matches. George Borrow. The Abolition of Fog. Mr. Gladstone's New Plan for the Redemption of Debt. The Theatres. Midsummer Racing.

*Les Quatre Vents de l'Esprit.*

Coral Islands. My Sister the Actress. Ward and Lock's Etymological Dictionary of the English Language. Volcanoes. Max Müller's Sacred Books of the East.—Vol. X. Part I. On Latmos. Publications of the English Dialect Society. French Literature.

London: Published at 38 SOUTHAMPTON STREET, STRAND, W.C.

## ADVERTISEMENTS.

DORE'S GREAT WORKS, "CHRIST LEAVING the PRÆTORIUM," "CHRIST ENTERING JERUSALEM," and "MOSES BEFORE PHARAOH," each 33 by 22 feet; with "Dream of Pharaoh's Wife," "Christian Martyrs," &c. at the DORE GALLERY, 35 New Bond Street. Daily, Ten to Six. 1s.

NEW ETCHING.—THE DEFENCE OF RORKE'S DRIFT, by the celebrated Etcher, L. FLAMENG, after the picture by DE NEUVILLE. The Artist's proofs, price 10 guineas, are now ready for delivery; but few remain unsold. The Fine Art Society, 145 New Bond Street.

ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S HOSPITAL and COLLEGE. OPEN SCHOLARSHIPS IN SCIENCE.

TWO SCHOLARSHIPS of the value of £100 each, tenable for one year, will be competed for on September 26th, and the three succeeding days. One of the value of £100 will be awarded to the best candidate at the Examination, under twenty years of age, if of sufficient merit. For the other, candidates must be under twenty-five years of age. The subjects of Examination are Chemistry, Botany, and Zoology. The Jeaffreson Exhibition will be competed for at the same time. The subjects of examination are Latin, Mathematics, and any two of the three following languages, Greek, French, or German. This is an Open Exhibition of the value of £50. Candidates must not have entered to the Medical or Surgical Practice of any Metropolitan Medical School.

The successful candidates will be required to enter at St. Bartholomew's Hospital in the October succeeding the examination.

THE LONDON HOSPITAL and MEDICAL COLLEGE, MILLETT, ETC.—THE SESSION 1881-82 will commence on Saturday, October 1, 1881. FOUR ENTRANCE SCHOLARSHIPS of £20, £20, £20, and £20, will be awarded for competition at the end of September, to new Students. Each scholarship to be paid for September 20. Fees for Lectures and Hospital Practice, 20 Guineas in one payment, or 100 Guineas in three instalments. All Resident and other Hospital Appointments are free. The Resident Appointments consist of Five House-Physicians, Four House-Surgeons, and One Accoucheur: Two Domestic and Two Hospital Pupils also reside in the Hospital. Special entries may be made for Medical and Surgical practice. The London Hospital is now in direct communication by rail and tram with all parts of the Metropolis.

MUNRO SCOTT, Warden.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, LONDON. The SESSION of the FACULTY of MEDICINE will begin on October 3. The SESSION of the FACULTIES of ARTS and LAWS, and of SCIENCE, will begin October 4.

Instruction is provided for Women in all subjects taught in the Faculties of Arts and Laws and Science. Prospectus, and Copies of the Regulations relating to the Entrance and other Exhibitions, Scholarships, &c. (value about £2,000), may be obtained from the College, Gower Street, W.C. The Examinations for the Entrance Exhibitions will be held on September 28 and 29. The SCHOOL for BOYS will RE-OPEN on September 27. The College is close to the Gower Street Station of the Metropolitan Railway.

TALEFOURD ELY, M.A., Secretary.

BRIGHTON COLLEGE. Principal—Rev. T. HAYES BELCHER, M.A., Queen's College, Oxford. Vice-Principal—Rev. J. NEWTON, M.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

The NEXT TERM will commence on Tuesday, September 20.

F. W. MADDEN, M.R.A.S., Secretary.

BATH COLLEGE, BATH.—The Next Term will commence on Saturday, September 17, 1881. Head-Master—T. W. DUNN, Esq., M.A., late Fellow and Assistant-Tutor, St. Peter's College, and for ten years a Master of Clifton College.

OXFORD MILITARY COLLEGE SCHOLARSHIPS.—SIX SCHOLARSHIPS. Two of £75 a year. Two of £50, and Two of £25, will be offered for Competition on September 6 and 7. Names to be sent before September 1 to the HEAD-MASTER, Military College, Oxford, from whom particulars may be obtained.

MALVERN COLLEGE. THE NEXT TERM commences Tuesday, September 27. For particulars, apply to HENRY ALDRICH, Esq., Secretary.

S. ANDREW'S COLLEGE, CHARDSTOCK, Dorset, RE-OPENS September 16. Preparation for Universities and Public Schools. Moderate and inclusive fees.—Apply to SECRETARY.

ISLE of WIGHT PROPRIETARY COLLEGE, APLEY (near RYDE). The WINTER TERM will commence on Friday, September 16. Full particulars from the Rev. CANON TEESDALE, Head-Master; or the SECRETARY, The Cottage, Melville Street, Ryde.

WELLS CATHEDRAL GRAMMAR SCHOOL.—Governors—the DEAN and CHAPTER of WELLS. Inclusive Fees (Board and Tuition), 50 Guineas a year. Preparatory Department for young Boys, 45 Guineas. The Climate of Wells is peculiarly suited to delicate Boys. Next Term will begin 45 September 9. For particulars apply to G. P. ABRAM, Esq., B.A., Head-Master, Cathedral Green, Wells, Somerset.

ST. EDMUND'S COLLEGE, SALISBURY.—A HIGH-CLASS SCHOOL for SONS of GENTLEMEN. The religious training is upon definite Church principles. Boys are Educated with much care and thoroughness. They receive individual teaching and help wherever needed. Candidates for Matriculation at the Universities are specially prepared. Terms, 475 a year.—For reference, prospectus, or any further particulars, apply to the Warden, Rev. G. H. BOURNE, D.C.L.

A BINGDON SCHOOL.—This Foundation (A.D. 1563), Six Miles from Oxford, has complete new buildings in large grounds. Classical and Modern Departments, with strong staff of Masters, valuable University Scholarships. Thorough preparation for the Military and other Professional Examinations, and careful grounding for the various directions of the Increasing Public Schools. Well-ventilated Private Studies and Infirmary, Fives-courts, rowing for Boys who swim. School Fees, £57 to £63; advantages to the Sons of the Clergy. Apply to the Rev. E. SUMMERS, B.D., Head-Master.

TRINITY COLLEGE SCHOOL, STRATFORD-ON-AVON.—The Warden, RICHARD CURRY, M.A., is assisted by Seven Resident Graduate Masters, two being specially for Modern Languages. Special preparation for the Universities, Army, and all competitive Examinations. Exhibition to the University of £50 per annum. Junior Department for Young Boys. Large Playing Fields, Gymnasium, &c. &c. Terms 50 and 60 Guineas.—Apply to the WARDEN.

SOUTH KENSINGTON PREPARATORY SCHOOL, 35 Hereford Square, Gloucester Road, S.W.—THE SONS of NOBLEMEN and GENTLEMEN are thoroughly prepared for Eton and other Public Schools. Careful individual attention. Special care of young Boys just leaving home. Experienced Governess for young Pupils. Head-Master—A. S. B. SCOTT.

PREPARATORY SCHOOL, AMESBURY HOUSE, Page Heath, BICKLEY, Kent.—Rev. EDMUND FOWLE receives THIRTY-THREE BOYS under the age of fifteen, to prepare for the Public Schools.

The house, surrounded by six acres of land, is situated in a charming locality, thirteen miles from London.

There is every requirement for a high-class Private School, a cricket and football ground, large iron playground, forming gymnasium, &c., two Eton fives-courts, workshop, dry playground, and a run of a third of a mile on a dry gravel path.

The soil is gravel, and all the Sanitary arrangements in and out of the house have been under the special supervision of Dr. ALFRED CARPENTER, of Croydon.

Every Educational advantage given and many comforts offered, the greatest care being taken of little Boys on their first leaving home.

Great success has been met with, several open Scholarships gained, and in no single case has a Boy failed to take his proper place at a public school.

Rev. EDMUND FOWLE is well known by his very successful series of Latin and School Books, and for his Eton Greek Reader, written by special request for that School, and now in use at Eton, Harrow, Merchant Taylors', &c. Terms, from 60 to 120 guineas.

Address, till further notice, Ballyards, Armagh.

OVERSALDE PREPARATORY SCHOOL (near RUGBY). The Rev. G. F. WRIGHT, M.A., late Fellow of C.C.C. Camb., formerly Assistant-Master at Shrewsbury School and Wellington College, prepares BOYS from Eight years of age for the Classical and Modern Sides of Public Schools.

HIGHGATE SCHOOL.—The Next Term commences Tuesday, September 20. In the Indian Civil Service Examination of this year a Pupil passed direct from the School 7th out of 31 successful Candidates, and was first for Greek and first for Latin of all the Candidates.—For particulars of admission, apply to the Rev. C. McDOWALL, School House, Highgate, N.

MILITARY and CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATIONS.—There is a Department in connexion with BLAIR LODGE SCHOOL, POLMONT STATION, Stirlingshire, for preparation for the above Examinations. Honours gained during the past year. Three Appointments to Woolwich Academy. Seventh Place for Indian Civil Service, &c. &c.—Full particulars on application to the HEAD-MASTER.

FINDEN PARSONAGE, WORTHING, SUSSEX.—The Rev. W. D. ALLEN, M.A., Vicar of Finden; Fellow and, from 1873-1881, Tutor of Magdalen College, Oxford; old Rugbeian, has Vacancies for HOUSE PUPILS, to be prepared for the Universities, &c.

ASHFORD SCHOOL, KENT.—Head-Master, E. C. MUSSON, M.A., F.G.S., formerly Scholar and Prizeman of Queen's College, Cambridge, sometime a Master in Cheltenham College. Very healthy situation. New buildings contain separate cubicles and a detached Infirmary. Terms low and strictly inclusive. Special preparation for Woolwich, Sandhurst, Legal and Medical Preliminary, &c.

PREPARATORY SCHOOL, Langley Place, LANGLEY, BUCKS.

Mr. W. E. W. COLLINS, late Scholar of Jesus College, Oxford, and for some time Composition Master at Richmond School, Yorkshire, and Mr. LEONARD B. KEYSER, for four years Assistant-Master at the Rev. J. W. Hawtree's, Aldin House, Slough, receive BOYS between the ages of Eight and Fourteen, to prepare for entrance on the Classical or Modern side of the Public Schools, or for the Royal Navy.

BOYS are also especially prepared for Junior Scholarships at any of the Public Schools.

Langley Place is a few minutes' walk from Langley Station, on the G.W.R.; is four miles from Windsor and two and a half miles from Slough. It stands on gravel soil, above the level of the Thames. The sanitary arrangements are excellent.

References and full particulars will be given on application at the above address.

THORNDENE, OAKLEIGH PARK, Station on G. N. R. Miss MATHER has vacancies for DAUGHTERS of GENTLEMEN. Large detached house. Large garden. Healthy situation. London Professors. Pupils take Honours at University Local Exams. Christmas Term will open September 30th.

COLLEGE and GRAMMAR SCHOOL, AUCKLAND, NEW ZEALAND. A HEAD-MASTER is REQUIRED for this Institution. He must have graduated in Honours at one of the leading Universities in the United Kingdom. He had experience and success as a Master in some important Public School. The salary will be £700 per annum, without house allowance, but with a Capitation Fee of 10s. per Pupil paying school fees. £150 will be allowed for passage money to the Colony.

The following application will be accepted as a Commencement in the selection of the Master:—Proposal of Blockland of Edinburgh; Proprietor of the Jests of Oxford; Author of Sidewicks, Esq., of Oxford; and the Rev. J. M. Wilson, Clifton College. Intending candidates can obtain of the School the undersigned application form and printed statement giving further particulars as to the School, and conditions of the appointment, &c. All applications must be made on the forms, and be sent in on or before September 30 to WALTER KENNAWAY, New Zealand Government Office, 7 Westminster Chambers, London, S.W.

